This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
1817

1279

THE

BURIAL AND RESURRECTION

OF

JESUS CHRIST,

ACCORDING TO THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

FROM THE GERMAN OF

JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS,

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT GÖTTINGEN,
PRIVY COUNSELLOR OF JUSTICE, KNIGHT OF THE POLAR STAR,
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY AT LONDON, AND
OF THE ACADEMY OF INSCRIPTIONS OF PARIS,
&c. &c.

LONDON:
J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.
1827.

BT
480
.M62

LONDON:
BOTSON AND PALMER, PRINTERS, SAVOY STREET, STRAND.

gift
Tappan Presb, Ass
1-30-1932

LIFE OF MICHAELIS.

JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS was born at Halle, the 27th of February, 1717. His father, Christian Benedict Michaelis, was Professor of Theology and the Oriental Languages. His first lessons were in his father's house, under tutors, from whom, he says, he learnt very little; they were very slow, and he was anxious to read Latin with more rapidity. Greek he learnt late in life; a circumstance he always regretted, but which arose from the disgusting and monstrous manner in which the Greek Testament was brought forward upon every occasion at the Orphan House at Halle, to which school, which was then very famous, he went from his own home. At fifteen years of age he become a semi-Pelagian, and the clergyman who confirmed him predicted, with some truth, he would live to change his opinions. It is singular that a man who has done so much for religion, should have been suspected, when a youth, of a disposition to ridicule it. The fact is, Michaelis had great wit, and great vivacity, and there are many who, in all countries, consider gravity as almost a constituent part of Christianity. He left Halle in

in 1733. Reiske, the two Baumgartens, Krüge, and Mittelstadt, men who became afterwards highly distinguished, were his schoolfellows. He made great progress in style, in Hebrew, in Latin poetry, and in the facility of disputation, such as it was practised at the University. The best method [illegible] of acquiring the grammar of a language, he found was an intimate and dissected knowledge of an eminent author. Gesner advised him to this, and he studied it with success in Virgil. The classic authors he always read out loud; and he held, that by a second reading he always became acquainted with a book, which he recommended to read over at first loosely. Of botany and astronomy he knew but little; at least what he called little, for he seemed to think that he should have made a greater figure in the world, if he had applied himself to the study and practice of physic. He subsequently made a tour into Holland and England.

In England he was well received, particularly at Oxford, and he confesses his religious opinions to have undergone a great change whilst in this country. The Germans alone, he said, were cool to him; he preached several times at the German chapel, St. James's. Whilst in England he had the misfortune not to become acquainted with Lowth, with whom he afterwards corresponded, and for whom he entertained the highest

respect. At that time there prevailed in this country a belief in the uniformity of all the Hebrew manuscripts, which prevented Michaelis from paying that attention to the subject which it has since enjoyed, and from which so much light has been thrown upon Biblical illustrations.

The doctrine of supernatural grace was carried to an extent in Germany, which, like all violent faiths, unfortunately subside in the opposite extreme. Here Michaelis found great advantage from his English residence. Upon his return to Halle his lectures were unusually well attended. Baron Munckhausen, who was most assiduous in founding the University of Göttingen, invited Michaelis, in 1745, to accept the Professorship of Philosophy, and here he formed that friendship with Haller and Gesner, which continued to the end of their lives. To the English reader it is of little consequence to know, that of the learned societies of that University, Michaelis was a most distinguished and leading member. The French were so sensible of his merit, that during the bloody war which raged between Prussia and Austria, and almost ruined Hanover, the peculiar privilege was accorded to him of being exempt from military quartering. Frederick the Great of Prussia considered it not beneath him to make overtures to Michaelis to settle in his kingdom, and left the conditions to his own choice; and Frederick the

Fifth of Denmark intrusted to him the entire management of the scientific Journey to Arabia, undertaken with a view to illustrate the Bible, and which terminated in the voyage of Niebuhr.

Whilst in England he made the acquaintance of Sir John Pringle and of Franklin; with the first of whom he was in strict correspondence. I mention Franklin, because as early as 1741 Michaelis had formed his own views of the approaching independence of America, but which Dr. Franklin, who was at one time much attached to England, considered completely visionary; the attempt, he said, would end in the bombardment of the maritime towns, and reduce the colonies to despair. The attempt however was made, but the maritime towns were never bombarded.

In 1775 he received from the King of Sweden the Order of the Polar Star, an honour the more gratifying, as it is exclusively national, and was accorded alone to Michaelis and to Haller. In 1789 he was made a Member of the Academy of Belles Lettres at Paris, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of London.

He gradually retired from the chair of the Professor into his private study, and devoted himself to the revisal of his numerous works. Amongst those which were left unfinished, his Life of David would have been most interesting, and the learning and originality which marks his Introduction to the Old Testament, creates a

regret that so little comparatively of it has been published.

Michaelis died the 22d of August 1791, aged 74 years. Germany seems to be ashamed that she has done so little for the memory of a man to whose vast learning and genius she owes, in conjunction with Europe, the most powerful arguments in favour of Christianity. His leading character was the love of truth; and, although parsimonious in money matters, he was charitable upon principle. It was a fine thing, said a subsequent writer, to see Michaelis enter the lecture room, the bible under his arm, booted and spurred, with his sword by his side and his order on his breast, and fix the attention of a delighted and crowded audience by the charms of his delivery, the felicity of his language, and the originality and efficiency of his information.

Heyne and Eichhorn, names well known to scholars, both wrote and spoke his eulogy in the society of which he was so long director. The Latin of Heyne is peculiarly elegant. There is here no necessity to recount the numerous and important works which will gradually exalt the fame of Michaelis. He was twice married. His son, Christian Frederick, who died at Marburg in 1814, was high in rank as an army physician, and equally so as a man of character, and distinguished professional attainments.

THE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

WHEN I first read Bishop Marsh's Translation of the Introduction to the New Testament by Michaelis, I regretted that so much learning and such genuine criticism should not be more accessible to the generality of readers; and remembering what Pascal says in his Provincial Letters, that his first object was to make them easy and popular, reserving the more abstruse parts for the end of his works, I have endeavoured to give to a subject, in which every one is equally and eternally interested, the advantages of familiarity and clearness. Of the Oriental languages I am unfortunately ignorant. To my competency in the Greek, Latin, and German, those who know me will bear witness; and if the following faithful, but imperfect translation, shall excite or confirm in any one a lively faith in the divinity and resurrection of Jesus Christ, I shall have been amply rewarded.

THE

BURIAL AND RESURRECTION

OF

CHRIST.

INTRODUCTION.

I MUST first acquaint my readers with the origin of the present treatise. No part of the history of Christ has created such difficulties, as that which relates to the Resurrection. Many of these have been obviated by commentators, but many still remained to excite curiosity or doubt. I admit, that there is no part of evangelical history which, upon the whole, is so little satisfactory. One reason, perhaps, may be, that what we ourselves steadfastly believe, we conclude others will believe with equal readiness: another reason is, that, in examining the question, too little attention has been paid to the circumstances, whether eye-witnesses and

apostles spoke, as in the gospels of Matthew and of John, or whether Mark and Luke, who were not so, were the narrators: and thirdly, whether the last eight verses of Mark are to be considered as undoubtedly genuine. Clergymen, whose profession leads them to preach upon given subjects, frequently take things for granted; and unbelievers seeing, as they fancy, the weak side of the question, attack them upon points, upon which the majority are unprepared. When I first lectured upon the Christian religion, I so implicitly followed my predecessor, that it was a considerable time, before these doubts operated with such force upon my mind, as to induce me seriously to discuss, and to endeavour if I could to remove, them. The resurrection of Christ is the corner-stone of Christianity; the apostles made it the foundation of their faith, and with reason, for a dead man, publicly crucified, coming again to life, cannot be an imposition, which it is possible to practise successfully. Any apparent contradictions, however, in the writings of the four evangelists are to me no argument against the truth of Christianity. They are an argument only against the divine inspiration of the evangelists, and reduce the question at once to the standard of credible history;

and in fact, where is the history told by distinct persons, in which, however true the basis, the details are not tinged with variations. For myself, I have always believed the history, independent of the narration of even the three first evangelists; I have already shown in my "Introduction to the New Testament," that the truth of Christianity does not depend upon the fact of the divine inspiration of its penmen, and that he, who wishes to convince another of its truth, must begin by considering the four evangelists as human beings, who wrote with all the conviction and sincerity of faith, but with all the fallibility of men. Time, however, and investigation gradually diminished the number of my doubts, and I felt convinced that the adoption of this principle, as applying equally to sacred and profane historians, would eventually and entirely remove them. Any apparent contradiction between Luke and Mark, especially in the last eight verses of the latter, gave me little uneasiness. Assuming even that the deficiency of our religious history had left the great question of the resurrection doubtful, and to those who lived in the first century it was not doubtful, still I had the miracles of Christ, which even the Jews admitted, the mi-

racles of the apostles, the prophecies relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the prophecies of the Old Testament, upon which to ground my faith. With this view, I read a course of lectures upon the subject, giving it every advantage which a predetermined impartiality could confer, and endeavouring to extract from colloquial as well as separate study the several benefits which are attached to both. The result was, that my doubts were completely tranquillized, and where there might be any thing like doubt or anxiety, I found it either in the last eight verses of Mark, or in a various reading, or in the translation of the original text into the Greek language. Four years afterwards, viz. in 1777, the famous fragments from the Library at Wolfenbüttel, in which the whole Christian religion, and, in particular, the history of the Resurrection was most acrimoniously attacked, made their appearance. Without farther enquiry into the name of the author, it may be sufficient to mention that the ignorance displayed in the several parts of the work was completely at variance with the great learning, by which it is said to have been dictated. The investigation became, from this circumstance, doubly interesting. Connected with this, was an attack upon

the credibility of the interment of Christ, in which the author avails himself of Luther's German translation, more defective in this, than in any other part of the translation, and even more defective than the one, published fifty years before Luther. It became, therefore, necessary, (and the subject rewarded itself,) to give to this point also the advantage of a strict and impartial examination. The course of lectures, which produced the present treatise, was given in 1782. These "Fragments," however, (the vehicle of a most violent attack upon the Christian religion,) made a great impression in Germany; but they are still untenable upon the main point: for allowing the author the benefit of the contradictions which he states to have discovered in the gospels, it does not follow, as Lessing has well observed, that the history of the interment and of the resurrection is false, but that the gospels were not the effect of immediate inspiration, and subject to the same fallibility which all men either confess or feel. If four men write a history of what has taken place in their own time, and do not all rectify their narrations by one and the same standard, it is almost impossible they should perfectly agree, and that they should not be liable to variations.

Take, for instance, two Prussian officers giving an account of the "Seven Years' War," and let them narrate it from strict and painful memory, there will still be variations, and in nothing more than in the two main points of time and number, and yet the groundwork will be essentially true. Writers from memory are more subject to mistakes, than those who copy from some book in which they have confidence, or who have agreed upon some data of history. In using the words "eye-witnesses," I beg to observe, that, in the instance of the resurrection, John, who was present, is the chief and the most important witness; Matthew and Mark are the next in value; and that Luke entirely depends upon what he has heard. Supposing, therefore, a contradiction to exist, namely, that two of the evangelists should say, "the women brought spices, in order to embalm Jesus on Sunday morning," but that another, an eye-witness, should say, "No; this was already done by Joseph and Nicodemus, when he was laid into the grave," this only proves that two have erred in what is by no means a fundamental point, not that the history is fundamentally false. Were this not the fact, we should have no history at all, for contemporary histo-

rians are always at variance, and if their writings were examined with the same scrupulous diligence as the New Testament, this would immediately be admitted. There are two things here to be separated: the investigation of an historian, and the testimony of witnesses in a court of law. The evidence given in the last case, generally takes place soon after the fact, but the historian writes several years afterwards, and this was the situation of the evangelists. In law, we usually hear those only who have been eye-witnesses, and if we appeal to the hearsay evidence of others, it is only for the benefit of more general information, although at the same time, it is not evidence, that we can adduce, or upon which we can rely. In the case of a murder or a theft, the main fact will remain undisputed, although no two witnesses may agree as to the quantity of money the person robbed may have in his strong box, or who struck the first blow: a court of law has the advantage over the historian, because they examine living witnesses, cross-examine them with jealousy, and finally obtain, what they believe to be the truest statement. Even if any contradictions should remain unexplained, the main fact will be still admitted. The conduct of Daniel, when a young man, in the apocry-

phal story of Susannah and the elders, is really an elucidation of the question. The main fact may have been true, and a person may take notice of what occurs under a tree, and yet not notice what the tree was. Such, however, is the criticism of a man, inimical to the Christian religion, who inconsistently denies the most important fact in the history of Jesus, solely in consequence of some apparent contradiction between historians, who were eye-witnesses, or who profess to have received their testimony from others, nor does it invalidate the same fact, when they differently relate, that the women saw one or two angels.

The opinion of Lessing deserves here to be recorded, because it is upon this opinion that certain authors have concluded him to be hostile to Christianity. What history, written by another, who lived at the same time, or who drew from books, and therefore more likely to agree, could stand the test of examination, if every collateral circumstance is expected to coincide with its fellow in another work? Take the Roman history, which presents, through different authors, such different statements, that the scholar is at a loss which to credit, although he may never have doubted the existence of a Punic war. A scholar, therefore, will imme-

diately feel the force of this observation, and will apply it substantially to the truth of that history which we are now to examine. Cæsar, the victor in the battle of Pharsalia, and Florus, a subsequent writer, make a difference in the number of combatants, to the amount of 150,000 men. Cæsar says nothing of his German soldiers, although through them he is said to have won the battle, and other historians speak of this circumstance as a recognised fact. No two authors ever agree in the amount of troops who formed the expedition of Xerxes; in the number of individuals, this is an easy error; but the groundwork remains undisputed. In modern history this is equally so, of which I would take for an example, two histories of the German empire, the one by Pütter, the other by Selchow. But would any one doubt the main facts which they relate? would he say there is no history of the German empire? No; he would say these historians, at least one of them, has been in error. The fact is, that the very nature of the Bible itself makes us more anxious and more diligent than we are, or should be, in profane history. The decapitation of John the Baptist is consistently recorded by those evangelists, but Josephus relates it in some degree differently. The sudden disease

which attacked Herod, and is recorded Acts xii. 19—23, and by Josephus in the nineteenth chapter of his Antiquities are much more opposed to each other, and in essential points too, than any contradictions, which occur in the history of the resurrection. But these two main facts are generally admitted. The history of the Maccabees presents some extraordinary circumstances, and this history is equally recorded by Josephus; it is probable, that this latter historian, as well as the author of the second and inferior book of the Maccabees, have committed great errors; but the grand historical fact is shown by the progress and independence of this Jewish aristocracy. Josephus, both in his Jewish history, as well as his subsequent Antiquities of the Jews, contradicts himself, but no one doubts the general excellence of Josephus as an historian. If, therefore, the account of the resurrection should present some apparent contradictions, are we, therefore, to conclude the whole account to be a fable? Such a conclusion is against all analogy, and against all reason. To this, however, it is answered, "Is the concurrent testimony of four writers sufficient to establish, not a circumstance which may occur every day, but the miraculous fact of the resurrection of a dead man?" To which I reply, "If the combined

history was so written as to present no apparent contradiction, would the testimony of the four evangelists be sufficient to convince me of the fact?" I should say, "No; laying out of all question the doctrine of inspiration, for I should then fancy that these four writers had previously agreed what to write, and this remarkable deviation from other historians would make me suspicious." I should say, "That the narration of four disciples of Jesus would, under those circumstances, not be sufficient to convince me."

But we do not believe the resurrection of Jesus upon the testimony and the details of the four evangelists! we believe it, because it was believed and known to be certain and true, above 1800 years ago, and before the evangelists and the apostles had written; we believe it upon the testimony of disciples who say, they were themselves eye-witnesses of the fact,—who saw Jesus after his resurrection,—who avowed it before the Synod at Jerusalem, although they knew that pain and anguish and misery would follow it; some of whom sealed their belief in the *fact*—(mind, not a belief in an *opinion*, for opinion, we know, will induce men to support their own ways of thinking at any risk,)—who sealed it with their blood, without any one of

them recalling that belief or disavowing their knowledge; without any one of them revealing the deceit, if deceit there was, but confirming rather their mission by the working of miracles and the communication of supernatural gifts; setting at defiance the Synod of Jerusalem, who never made any judicial inquiry into the subject, as to where the body of Jesus was, or whether his disciples had actually stolen it.

To have publicly ascertained such a theft and such an imposition, (and, in this case, the arbitrary use of torture was a ready instrument in the hand of a sanguinary governor,) would at once have removed the imputation which the high priests conceived might attach to them, Acts v. 28: "You will bring the blood of this man upon us," and would have completely crushed the new religion. To have confessed the theft would have been sufficient, but the investigation might have gone further; it might have produced the avowal of the fact, and the discovery where the body was concealed. A man whose face was known throughout Palestine, and whose dead body exhibited marks of crucifixion, whose side had been pierced with a spear, and whose legs remained unbroken, was not an object that could be easily mistaken; in fact, no other

dead body could have been produced for it. If the high priests had any confidence in their own case, they would, as a matter of course, have instituted investigation; but this they never did, although they admit the body to have been in the grave, and confined themselves to the assertion, that the disciples stole it. Herod Agrippa, who certainly was no mean enemy of Christianity, and was a warm friend of the Jews, never ordered any inquiry to be made, although to please them, (Acts xii.) he ordered James to be executed and Peter to be imprisoned; and the torture was then a common mode of examination, and would have been used with very little ceremony; but we find no attempts at investigation. Indeed the proofs of Christianity were at its origin so strong, that it fairly gained the cause by its intrinsic strength, and persecution had not the power to arrest its progress.

I am going, however, too far for a preface, when the object of the work itself is to examine doubts and reconcile contradictions. The whole, however, of these objections, supposing the contradictions irreconcilable, and that they still operated upon our several minds, is, that the evangelists were not inspired by God, that they were fallible men, like other historians, and that,

consequently, our doctrine of inspiration must be received with some modification. And here, I think, Lessing was justified, when he asserted, that admitting this to be a fact, the cause of religion would not suffer by it. When he was attacked upon this subject, he, in order to show that he held this doctrine in common with many strenuous advocates of the Christian religion, recapitulated the observations I have previously made, and part of which I will here subjoin:—

"The question of the inspiration of the books of the New Testament is not so important as their authenticity. Christianity does not depend upon it. Supposing Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul not to have been inspired by God, still their writings were old, genuine, and credible, and Christianity would equally be true. The miracles, by which it is supported, do not rest upon the evidence, which relates them, being inspired; when we examine them, we rely on their credibility, as brought forward by human witnesses. If the miracles are true, the precepts of Christ, as delivered to us, would be infallible, only with this distinction, that those who have related them may, perhaps, have erred in some minute details; and even supposing any clerical mistakes to have crept into

the writings of the apostles, the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are still superior to any system of philosophy that exists. A man may, therefore, deny generally the divine inspiration of the New Testament, and yet perfectly believe the Testament to be true; nor would you venture to say of such a man he was not a Christian. It was the case, perhaps, with many old heretics, who made a strong distinction between the authenticity and the infallibility of the New Testament." I must here beg to add, that the question in this case is confined to the four gospels, and even in these, limited to the delivery of historical facts. In proof of their infallibility, we have no direct authority in the New Testament, but merely a prevailing opinion, of which it may be said, it does not gain ground. The passage in John xiv. 26, "The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," applies, in the first instance, to the apostles, consequently to Matthew and to John, and not to Mark and Luke, but chiefly with respect to the words of Christ, which, of course, are the main foundations of our faith; but it does not, judging from the words of the

passage, extend to historical facts, or to matters of hearsay. More than this, I do not pretend to say. But supposing the four evangelists not to have been inspired, so far as relates to the recollection of facts, I do not see what we should lose by it. We use the history of the life, the miracles, the death, and the resurrection of Jesus, against every species of unbelievers, without presuming the divine inspiration of the history. I have known Jews admit, (who, of course, did not admit the divine inspiration,) that Jesus must have been sent from God. The reverse would only be an interminable argument, if we reasoned upon the Christian religion without appealing to the evangelists, as human testimony. I cannot see, I repeat, what we should lose, if we consider the evangelists not as inspired, but as honest, credible men. They say nothing themselves of their inspiration, and Luke expressly states in his beginning, that he has acquired his knowledge from the information of others, and had taken great pains to ascertain whether it was accurate.

I am not certain, whether we should not gain by admitting, that the evangelists were fallible, like other men, and that John, who wrote his gospel last of all, had constantly in

his eye the other gospels, and where there was any thing either defective or incorrect, gently rectified and supplied both. For, after all, the great argument of the adversaries of Christianity rests upon ostensible and partial contradictions, and frequently upon points of such insignificance, that they would not be noticed in other historians. But, besides this, our published harmonies of the gospels have, occasionally, a forced and artificial character, which we are not accustomed to find even in contradictory historians of minor importance, and which consequently leave in our minds, an unpleasant or a suspicious feeling. He, who has read the defence of Lessing may easily judge of his sentiments, which seem to have been grounded upon this feeling. No man better understood the force of language, but he is now dead, and I have, therefore, no means of ascertaining the extent of our agreement. I must here make another, and a very important observation. We should always inquire, "Who is it, that contradicts, or seems to contradict, the other evangelists?" for some contradictions, although they appear so evident and unanswerable, have no connection with our doctrine of inspiration, and we merely confine

ourselves to contradictions, between the two apostles, Matthew and John. These cases are,

1. The last twelve verses of Mark xvi. 9—20, contradict another evangelist. But here the doctrine of inspiration does not apply, for no man can say, whether these last twelve verses were written by Mark or not. It is here, that the most prominent contradictions are said to occur; these I have endeavoured, with what success the reader will judge, to obviate; at all events, they may be admitted, without affecting the doctrine of inspiration.

2. The remaining or genuine part of Mark contradicts another evangelist.

3. The gospel of Luke contradicts another evangelist. In all these cases, the doctrine of inspiration is not affected, as these evangelists were not apostles, and it was to these last alone the promise of recollecting the words of Jesus was given, upon which promise we found the inspiration of the apostolic writings. In the case of Luke, this is more particularly striking, as he himself states, he was not an eye-witness, and, consequently, if he had no supernatural infallibility, was more likely to fall into error, and hence it is, we find in his gospel, those difficulties, which are the most

difficult to obviate. In my introduction to the New Testament, I have mentioned some doubts, as deduced from 2 Peter i. 15, in favour of the canonical authority of Mark, but I am far from thinking them satisfactory, for Peter might confide to Mark the writing of a gospel, and supply him with materials, which Matthew might not have, and yet not transfer to him the spiritual advantages, which were promised to himself. It may be asked, whether we do not deviate from the doctrine of our church, if we give up the inspiration of Luke and Mark? But who are the *we*, to whom this question is addressed? Certainly not the Lutherans, for our books have not decided what writings are canonical, and what are not. Luther himself was doubtful upon this point, namely, whether inspiration was confined to doctrine, or extended to historical facts. Our books, not our sermons, must determine this question. The only case therefore, that can occur, is between Matthew and John, both apostles, and both eye-witnesses, particularly John. The only one, that approaches to it, is in Matthew xxvii. 60, where, in point of fact, there is no contradiction, and even if there is, still a various reading exists to supply or correct this deficiency

But were this latter not even the case, and the contradiction remained unanswered, it would be still subject to this exception. Matthew and John, were, according to the promises of Christ, inspired; let this promise extend from matters of faith and moral doctrine, to historical facts; the promise would then only apply to the original text. This, in the case of Matthew, was the Hebrew; for so I must believe in connection with all antiquity, and this text is now lost to us: we have only a Greek translation: there is no translator who does not err; the contradiction, therefore, is not between Matthew and John, but between John and the Greek translator of Matthew, who, as I shall observe in another place, appears to have erred in his translation, for the whole contradiction rests upon two words, which Mark, who had Matthew before him, has not, or at least has in a different way. In fact, therefore, our doctrine of inspiration, as it was promised to the apostles, and adopted by us as the ground of faith, the guide of our conduct, and the principle of knowledge, has no connection with the remaining, if, indeed, there are any remaining, contradictions: the doctrine only of other writers, not canonical,

is affected by them. Great as my respect is for Lessing, there is one requisition of his, to which I cannot easily assent. He says, "The man, who maintains the infallibility of the evangelists in every word, will here find a sufficiency of uncultivated ground. In attempting this he must answer ten celebrated contradictions; but let him answer them all, for to answer them partially, and pass over others with the triumph of contempt, is, in fact, not answering them at all."

Against this I have to remind my reader,

1. That to answer them all is certainly unnecessary to the attainment of the proposed object; for if the contradictions between the last twelve verses of Mark and the other evangelists were unanswered (and this is the chief field of controversy) and all the other contradictions *were* answered, there would be then no necessity to give up the doctrine of the infallibility of the evangelists. But I go further; it need not be given up, if the Greek translator of Matthew, unsupported by Mark, should be contradicted by another evangelist.

2. The requisition is besides severe, because I certainly have the right of exercising my own judgment as much as in any other historical in-

vestigation. One man has it not in his power to do every thing; he may resolve some difficulties, but still he must leave others for some another and more successful person, and when I find some difficulties gradually removed, I live in hopes of seeing the others removed also. It is thus that we proceed in the regions of reason and probability, we believe one thing, in consequence of overwhelming evidence, notwithstanding another difficulty may still remain behind. Some readers, perhaps, may require more—they may require me to speak without doubt, (for doubt will unavoidably attach to every man,) and at once distinctly declare, whether I believe the evangelists to have been inspired and infallible in matters relating to fact, or not? To speak plainly, but, at the same time, to influence no other person, I here coincide with Lessing, although twenty years ago I thought differently. I see no proof of the inspiration of the evangelists in historical facts, but what they must have already known from ocular demonstration; or what, as in the case of Luke, they must have known from other, and preceding writers, and then have appealed to eye-witnesses, to ascertain whether the facts were true or not. (Luke i. 1—4.) The promise

of Jesus (John xiv. 26,) applies only to his words, the last and the highest ground of our belief; these the Holy Spirit was to bring again to the recollection of his apostles (and Mark and Luke were not apostles); but the promise did not comprise history and matters of detail. I hold the same opinion with respect to the historical books of the Old Testament, with the exception, however, of one book, which no reasonable man would attempt to compose, without the help of revelation,—namely, the history of the creation, for this, in fact, if he was desirous of writing truth, he could not have from witnesses, and as little from books, as the materials and foundation of his history. I put conjectures out of the question, for conjectures are not history; if, therefore, Moses, the great prophet, writes, by the command of God, a book, of which the history of the creation forms the beginning; a history, which contradicts the system of the ancients, rises over all the knowledge of the times, in which Moses flourished, and even in its very commencement singularly coincides with the freshest discoveries of the present and preceding centuries, then I think, that this history he could only know from God. I therefore look upon

these historical books, written and preserved by divine command, as essential to religion; without them we should not know the ground, upon which we stand; but that which depends upon matter of fact, and upon the memory and the senses of man, is equally attached to other histories, and does not presume inspired infallibility.

I must here make some special observations upon the manner of writing by the evangelists, and particularly by the last evangelist John, as of more immediate import to the history of the resurrection. I have alluded to this branch of my subject several times in the book itself, but being unable to enlarge upon it at any particular passage, I have reserved it for my preface. The common opinion which has been handed down to us from Eusebius, in conformity with ancient tradition is,

1. That John wrote subsequently to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and was the last of the evangelists.

2. That John had read the three other evangelists.

3. That he confirmed them in main facts, and added, intentionally, many circumstances, which he did not find in their gospels.

I adopted this principle in my introduction to the New Testament, because it appeared to me just as clear and indispensable, as it does now. The extensive influence of the two last propositions upon the harmony of the gospels was a subsequent consideration, and forms an appendix to the introduction, which I hold to be one of the most important parts of the essay.

It appears to me, from the book itself, that John had seen and read the other evangelists, although Dr. Semler doubts it from the authority of the words, chap. xx. 30, "which are not written in this book," in which John does not mention any other evangelist; upon which I made the following comment: "John omits so much, as to make it probable, he supplies the deficiency from other sources; indeed, without this supposition, his gospel would be unintelligible; such for instance as in John xviii. 24—28,* the hearing before Caiaphas, and the answers of Jesus, upon which his subsequent accusation before Pilate is grounded. In general, in the history of our Saviour's

* Read with attention the verses, observing, that the facts are stated, as already notorious.

sufferings, which he has in common with the other evangelists, he purposely avoids saying, what the others have said before him, except, where, in conformity with the subject, or with a view to elucidation, it becomes necessary."

1. John says nothing of what Jesus did, or intended to do before Caiaphas, who, according to him, was the next great person, and actually high priest; he takes him to Caiaphas, v. 24, and v. 28, he conducts him again to Pilate. This is, in other words, assuming, that the reader must have known from distinct sources, what took place before the proper judge. 2. There is no accusation, no production of evidence, no sentence even; he is delivered up to Pilate, as a condemned malefactor. 3. The two false witnesses are omitted, whose evidence, as we find in another evangelist, John had virtually prepared his readers to understand, chap. ii. 20, 21.

I will show, in a few examples, that John not only had read the gospels, but wrote for those, who had read them, and assumes, therefore, many things as known through them, without which assumption his gospel could not be well understood. We should always bear in mind, that of all the evangelists, and bibli-

cal writers, John is, by far the most distinct, and when, therefore, we find passages omitting, what the other evangelists have written, and particularly obscure to those, who had not read the other evangelists, we may conclude the fact, to which he has either alluded, or which he has omitted, to be previously well known.

He nowhere mentions, that Christ was baptized, or at least, that he was baptized by John, or that, at the baptism, the Holy Ghost, in the semblance of a dove, descended upon him, and yet he makes John the baptist, subsequently say, "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he, which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God," chap. i. 33, 34. If he is not a wonderfully confused and extraordinary narrator, he here assumes readers, who knew all this from the three first evangelists.

Chap. iii. 24. "For John was not yet cast into prison." He here assumes as a fact, which the reader knows from other sources, that John the baptist had been imprisoned, but of which John the evangelist says nothing.

This is the more striking, because John the evangelist wrote his gospel not in Judea, where the imprisonment and execution of John the baptist might have been locally known, but at Ephesus, where it could not have been known, except through the information of prior historians.

Chap. iv. 43, 44. "Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee; for Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country; then, when he was come into Galilee, the Galileans received him." This would be perfectly obscure, if we did not know from the other evangelists, that Nazareth in Galilee was the place, where Jesus was educated, and from which he was, for that reason, named—that he once came as a Teacher, endowed with the power of miracles, into this his early dwelling place—that he was despised, and even threatened to be thrown headlong from a rock—that he then said what is here stated by John, namely, that a prophet is no where so despised as in his own country—that he abstained from further connection with them, and travelled in other parts of Galilee. He, who knows this from the other gospels, understands the gospel of John, which unites what

is known in them, with the account of the journey to Samaria, a narration, peculiar to himself, and which, if he has not read them, renders a narration, (in every other respect, singularly clear,) difficult and unconnected.

Chap. xii. 16. The disciples had long had it in remembrance, namely, that the Messiah, coming and riding upon an ass had been predicted in the prophets, "and that they had done these things unto him." But John does not repeat what the disciples did, but assumes it, as already known from the other gospels, making, as is usual with him, additions of his own, that the disciples had loosened and brought him the ass, which some had bound upon the road.

Chap. xv. 20. "Remember the word that I said unto you;" this implies a reader, who is acquainted with what Jesus had previously told to his disciples, and with the subsequent events; these, however, are not recorded by John, but by the other evangelists. In the history of the resurrection, other examples will be brought forward in illustration of this general observation. From these, however, the mode, or as we now say, the manner of John in narration, becomes easier to be understood.

In concurrence with this, he generally omits what the other evangelists have written, and it is thus, that by far the greatest part of the life of Jesus, which we read in *them*, is wanting in *him*; we must not, therefore, argue from this omission that there is a contradiction between him, and the other evangelists; but this is a favourite ground with unbelievers; John does not even mention, that Jesus was born, but this, no unbeliever denies. When, however, he has any thing in common with the other evangelists, it is generally in one of these cases:

1. When he is desirous of using the repetition as an introduction to some very important and necessary detail, such for instance, as the history in the sixth chapter, of Jesus feeding five thousand men with five loaves, and of his walking on the sea. These are related by the four evangelists, but the object of John is to relate the valuable discourses connected with the middle of the chapter, and this he could not have done, or have been intelligible, unless he had introduced the previous history which gave rise to the discourses, and here, he as a subsequent writer, adds, and, I may say, improves. But of this hereafter.

2. Another time it seems to be his object to

add circumstances, omitted in the other evangelists; as for instance, he relates, in common with them, in his twelfth chapter, the supper at Bethany, the unction of Jesus, and his entrance into Jerusalem, but here there are important additions, especially that of Lazarus, of whom, as I have observed in my introduction, the others had so much reason to be silent, and whose name illustrated his splendid entrance into Jerusalem, chap. xii. 1, 2, 17, 18. nor must we omit the name of Judas Iscariot, (v. 4, 5.) who may here have formed his resolution to betray Jesus from a principle of hatred and envy. In fact, the history of the temper and treason of this unfortunate man, and at the same time, the strongest evidences of Christianity may be more completely and instructively drawn from this evangelist, than from any other.

3. When the other evangelists have been either incomplete, or obscure, he either amplifies, or illustrates; so far at least I may say, and, in truth, I do not like to go further, if I wish to adhere to the doctrine of our church, with respect to the divine inspiration in historical details, and their miraculous infallibility. Assuming, however, the reverse, then I should

say, that, where his predecessors have failed in any instance, the superior information of John rectifies their narration. We should find hereafter, sufficient examples of this assertion, especially, where they tend to illustrate; some few, where mistakes are rectified. But every reader must judge for himself, and I am not desirous of forestalling judgment. To give one instance, and yet, without wishing to prejudice the reader, compare John vi. 21. with the parallel passages in the other evangelists, and inquire, whether the eye-witness, and a most accurate observer of facts, and the subsequent reader of the gospels of the other writers does not here make some, although a very slight correction?

If that, which I have said in this treatise, with a view to obviate the objection, "that Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, having already embalmed Jesus at his burial, it was singular, that the women, according to Luke and Mark, should be also desirous of embalming him, and the more so, when a guard was purposely placed before the grave;" if this, I say, gives my reader no satisfaction, and he exclaims, my doubts, or rather the contradiction still remains, then, I repeat, let it remain, and

the contradiction of John will resolve itself into one of these mild and minor corrections. Mark and Luke, who were not eye-witnesses, will then have only committed a very slight error, and the language of John is then "Other biographers of Jesus have heard something of embalming, and have not clearly understood it. The women did not wish to embalm Jesus; they wished once more to see his grave, he was already embalmed by Nicodemus." He could decidedly give more accurate information, than any other disciple, because he alone of all the disciples remained at the cross, and the mother of Jesus was with him in the house. The reader, however, must decide for himself. But in this case, this gentle correction of a statement of his predecessors is not to me so probable as the answer, which is given in the book itself. The charge which has been brought against Christianity by its enemies is singular and untenable: "The evangelists come forward, as witnesses, or rather historians of what they had seen and heard, and who have arranged with one another, but who have forgotten to arrange a complete history." Certainly if they had made this arrangement, they would not have been charged with ten contradictions,

which, after all, are mere quibbles, and only prove, even under a perfect impossibility of explanation, that they had not made a previous arrangement. It would appear like an early history, correct as to the main point, but not investigated with critical or judicial acuteness; and this is the case with all the first narrations of any fact, which is, in substance, true, but in effect, wonderful and extraordinary. But here are writers, who wrote many years after one another, and of whom the latest (Luke alone excepted) had read the writings of his predecessor, so that it was only necessary, if they wished to write falsehoods, that Mark should dress by Matthew, and for John, who had read them all, to contradict no one, and not even in the mildest manner to rectify him. But they certainly do not appear in the light of historians, who had entered into any previous agreement.

BURIAL AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

I. JESUS IS ACTUALLY FOUND DEAD UPON THE CROSS, AND PIERCED.

JOHN, XIX. 31—37.

31. " *The Jews, therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath-day, (for that sabbath-day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their bones might be broken, and that they might be taken away.*

32. " *Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other, which was crucified with him.*

33. " *But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs.*

34. " *But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water.*

35. " *And he that saw it, bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.*

36. *" For these things were done, that the Scriptures should be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken.*

37. *" And again another Scripture saith, they shall look on him, whom they pierced."*

This history is entirely in the manner of John, who loves to supply, what the other evangelists have omitted. He was, as he himself says, an eye-witness of the event, and stood by the cross. To him it appeared in a most striking point of view, on account of the fulfilment of two passages in the Old Testament, and to us, who live in later times, it becomes still more important in another, to which probably John did not advert at the time, namely, it obviates one objection to the resurrection of Jesus, that he might not have been really dead, but only in a fit;—who, therefore, can be surprised, that he who in other respects, is so accustomed to minute additions, should add this fact, which was neither seen nor noted by others? The silence of the other evangelists is no contradiction, for what historian relates every thing? Besides, it is evident from the other evangelists, that something of this kind must actually have occurred. He who reads them will naturally imagine that the bodies of the two thieves

were taken away with Jesus from the cross, and that consequently those, who were crucified with him, were dead before the evening. According to Luke, this is certain, for Jesus says, (ch. xxiii. v. 43.) to one of them, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." As now a crucified person does not die in the course of nature upon the first, but at the earliest, upon the third day, (and this not from loss of blood, but from gangrene,) and many even live to the seventh day, it is evident from the evangelists themselves, that something like that which John relates must have taken place; and that the mortal blow must have been actually given them; this, perhaps, they omit, because this anticipated death was then tolerably common with them in the same way as in our history of a man broken alive upon the wheel, we seldom mention the finishing stroke, which releases him from his miseries. But we shall go further into this subject, as our inquiry extends itself. That the bones of Jesus were not broken with a club, every one who has read the history of the resurrection in the three first evangelists, will readily conceive, for if they had assumed the fact, that the bones were broken, they must either as historical inventors, or as positive

liars, have provided for his capability of walking after his resurrection. The singular circumstance of his early death is noted by Mark, ch. xv. v. 39. all the others say, he died on the same day, which in the case of a crucified person, whether they observe upon it or not, is something unusual.

31. The Jews had no literal law from Moses, prohibiting the body of a crucified person, such person being still living, from being left upon the cross upon the sabbath, or the whole night; for, according to the Mosaic law, the punishment of crucifixion, or even of hanging a man upon a tree or post, was not common amongst them; they only hung malefactors, who were dead, stoned to death for instance upon a post. I have explained this in my 235th section upon the Mosaic law. It may be that in this case the hanging would not be done by cords, but by nailing to a piece of wood, and consequently a species of crucifixion, for the Hebrew word, which conveys this meaning, (Numbers xxv. 4. 2 Samuel xxi. 6, 9, 13.) signifies in no eastern language, "hanging as hanging up;" in Arabic it imports "beating with a hammer;" it may be well, therefore, translated where it occurs, "attaching the malefactors to a post."

Crucifixion was by no means unusual amongst the Persians, and in Genesis xl. 19., a man whose head had been taken off, is afterwards suspended to a tree. It is at least not our method of hanging a man, with a rope round his neck. But if the Hebrews did nail to a post, or in fact, crucify, it was always punishment or disgrace after death, in the same way as we nail the head of a malefactor to the post of a wheel, but living persons were not crucified. The passage in Deuteronomy xxi. 22, 23.—"If a man have committed a sin, worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree," (gallows or cross?) "but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day," relates solely to those who were already dead. For the laws of Moses did not enjoin that the living should be crucified, but required that the malefactor, who was crucified or hung, should not remain suspended after he was dead, and thus corrupt the air of the living. Therefore, according to the letter of the law, malefactors might have remained all night, hanging upon the cross, and have continued even to the third or seventh day. But it would seem that the Jews, who did not explain this so dogma-

tically, were shocked if any one, even supposing him to be alive, remained all night upon the cross; and I am not surprised at it. The legislator, who did not wish men to be crucified alive, and that not even the dead should remain all night upon the cross, would have been little inclined to sanction such a severe punishment, as that of leaving a person to expire slowly, and for his body to corrupt upon the spot. It may be said with truth, that their explanation was not the letter, but was the spirit of the Mosaic law. The Roman governors adapted themselves, in many things, to the manners and opinions of the Jews. Pilate does something of the kind in this instance, but we may see from the narration of John himself, that this was only in consequence of the extraordinary sabbath, and that otherwise the Romans allowed those, who were crucified, to hang all night, and even until they died, upon the cross. According to his statement, I represent to myself the case thus; in general the crucified person hung until he died of gangrene, the Jews looked upon this as contrary to the law, and still more so, if it occurred upon a sabbath, of which it was considered a violation. They were, however, obliged to submit. But this

sabbath, falling upon the Easter feast, when so many hundred thousand Jews were collected at Jerusalem, not merely from the Roman, but from the Parthian dominions, and from the extreme East, seemed to form an exception in their favour, and to justify their application for the removal of a sight, so publicly offensive to the adherents of the Mosaic law. They, therefore, acted upon it, and Pilate acceded to their prayer. This may, indeed, have been the case at other Easter festivals, for upon great occasions, executions of any celebrity were ordinarily postponed, in order to make the greater impression, and the governor was in general then at Jerusalem, although he usually resided at Cæsarea. I have no means of knowing who the Jews were, who made this request to Pilate; whether the Sanhedrim, who are sometimes designated by John, "the Jews," or whether they were foreign Jews, who were shocked at the spectacle. If the first, the application must have been early, when Pilate condemned Jesus, and in this case we must translate it "they had besought," (ηρώτησαν,)—if the last, the application must have been, in all probability, late before sun-set, and subsequent to Joseph of Arimathea requesting the body of Jesus, after

he had expired. What I am here saying, I shall explain more fully hereafter, when I come to treat upon ostensible contradictions, between John and Mark, and which, as far as I can trace, has not been noticed by the enemies of Christianity.

"*Because it was the preparation,*"]—namely, Friday. These words, and not as is generally done, those only which follow, should be put into a parenthesis. John uses them to make intelligible to his readers what he says, "that the bodies should not remain upon the cross, upon the sabbath-day." By this he informs us, that it was upon the day answering to our Friday, when Christ was crucified and died. I here feel myself called upon to explain more minutely the meaning of the word "preparation," (παρασκευὴ,) as it occurs in Mat. xxvii. 62. Mark xv. 42, where it is explained, as being the day before the sabbath, (προσαββατον,) Luke xxiii. 54. John xix. 19—42., and here in this 31st verse of the same chapter, the importance of the word, as well as our German translation by Luther seems to require it. I would venture to say, that one half of those who read it, conceive it to be the holy evening before the feast of the passover; and it is thus that many,

even learned men, have reasoned, saying, the sabbath was so great, because the first Easter-day, which was a sabbatical festival, fell upon the weekly sabbath, and it has been used even in some instances, as an argument against the truth of the resurrection. The passages, the most illustrative of this word, are to be met with in Wetstein, Walch, and Dufresne. It is worth while to condense and to submit to the reader the sentiments of these writers. The Jews, not those who lived before the Babylonish captivity, (for amongst these last we find no traces of it,) but those who conformed to the subsequent tenets of the Pharisees, strictly observed the Friday afternoon from three o'clock, as a preparation for the sabbath, or as an holy evening, according to our notions of time. The supper (for fasting is not a sabbatical festival, when friends are invited and this day was one of rejoicing,) was a subject of consequence, as they began to abstain from work, with a view to sanctify the day of rest, ordained by God. Hence they named both in Hebrew, and in Chaldee, the whole Friday, "the evening," in the same way as we, in German, name the day before the Sunday, "the Sun-evening." The name, thus, came into the Arabic, and

probably into the Syrian, because the Jewish religion, previous to, and for some time subsequent to the Christian æra, was very powerful, and the prevailing religion upon the throne in many parts of Syria, in Petræa, and in Arabia Felix. Both the Syriac versions adopt this signification of the word, for wherever "preparation" is to be translated in the New Testament, the Syriac uniformly renders it "Friday." The Jews, who spoke Greek and Latin, used the word, which in both those languages is translated by "preparation," always as signifying "Friday." The oldest and the most important passage is to be met with in an edict of Augustus, and shows us that the word was already in his time used in this sense, both in Greek and Latin, whenever it related to Jewish affairs. Josephus has inserted the whole edict in his Antiquities, b. 16, sec. 6, 3, from which the following passage is an extract. "That the Jews were not to be summoned before the tribunals, upon the sabbath, nor upon the preparation, preceding it from the ninth hour, (i. e. from three o'clock in the afternoon,) when the Jews withdrew themselves from worldly affairs."

Another passage from Irenæus, who lived in the second century, is, of course, not so valu-

able in respect of antiquity, but equally so in respect of precision of language; it is in his first book against Heresy, (ch. 14, sec. 6.) "Moses therefore says, that man was created on the sixth day, which, deeply considered, is—that the second man appeared on the sixth day, which is the preparation," (or Friday,) "for the regeneration of the first man." A passage of Dioscorides is still more important—it is quoted by Wetstein, but I cannot lay my hands upon it, as he does not mention the edition. "The Syrians say," (speaking of a certain decoction, with which I am unacquainted, as the chief word is wanting,) "that given on the second, and the fourth, and the preparation," (namely, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday,) "it cures fever," and he adds, "I hold this to be a great secret, for experience convinces me of its correctness." Walch ascertained a similar meaning in some of the fathers of the Church, and gives an additional light to a passage in Origen in his eighth book, against Celsus. Origen, who had previously maintained the doctrine, that "to observe his duty was to him a festal solemnity, and that consequently every day was a festival," obviates an objection, which had been made against the feasts and ceremonies of the Christians.

" But if any one would reproach us with our Lord's days, (Sundays,) our preparation days, (Fridays,) or our Easter or Pentecost, &c." the old Christians celebrated every Friday in the week by a fast. Here Origen speaks first of the Sundays, and then of the Fridays. " But he who steadily prepares himself for the true life, keeps constant preparation days," i. e. every day is as holy with him as the weekly Friday, consecrated to the remembrance of Christ. Walch quotes here an important passage from Clement of Alexandria. Strom. B. 12. c. 7. " The true Gnostick understands the mystery of these days of fasting of the fourth, and of the preparation day, of which the first is named from Mercury, and the second from Venus." Who does not see that the preparation day is here the day of Venus, namely, Friday? He further quotes the remarkable words of Peter of Alexandria. " Let no man blame us for keeping the fourth and the preparation days," (Wednesdays and Fridays,) " on which days, according to tradition, we ought to fast." After having explained the reason of the Wednesday's fast, he adds " on the preparation day we fast because on that day," (Friday,) " he suffered for us." Dufresne has observed in his Glossary, that the great or

holy preparation day, is, in the language of the church, "Good Friday." Theophylact, quoted by Fabricius, says, "This day is called the day of preparation, for, as the Jews prepare on the sixth day of the week, what they intend to eat on the seventh, so they call it the preparation day." He quotes likewise from a manuscript chronology, extending from Adam to Leo Philosophus, and which must have been, therefore, written in the ninth or tenth century, the following passage, "Constantine decreed many laws affecting Christians, and ordained the consecration of the preparation day (Friday,) and of the Sunday, the one on account of the crucifixion, the other on account of the resurrection of the Lord." From these passages it is evident, that the Greek word "Parasceue" signified Friday, and not merely a preparation for a high festival. It is used in this first sense in the Latin, and generally in the Vulgate, the Greek word being retained in the Latin translation, and especially, according to the testimony of Blanchini in the greater part of the translations previous to Jerome. It occurs frequently in the fathers, as Friday, and is explained in this sense in Gesner's dictionary, and by Wetstein in ap-

propriate quotations from Victorinus Petavionensis and Augustin. It may, therefore, be assumed as indubitable that the "Preparation Day" or rather the Greek word, which renders it, is "Friday." If Luther had so translated it, it would have obviated many frivolous doubts and objections; but Luther, in his translation of the New, was not the same powerful man he was when he translated the Old Testament. The translations, which preceded him, have some of them the "Holy," or as we should say, "Good Friday."

"*That their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.*"] The above is the usual translation, but the Vulgate has a different expression, which coincides better with the ambiguity of the Greek text. According to the received translation, every reflecting reader will come to the following conclusion: that when the bones of any one are broken with a club, he will not die before sunset, so as to enable the body to be taken away; it is, in fact, not a mortal blow. He may, and probably would, survive twenty-four hours. This has been remarked of those, who have been broken alive upon the wheel, from the feet upwards; the bones are broken, but if there is no blow, imme-

diately affecting the vital parts, they will live twenty-four hours after having been thus attached to the wheel. All our commentators entirely overlook this difficulty; I inquired of Mr. Wrinsberg, our professor of anatomy, in what time and in what manner a man would probably die, whose bones had been broken upon the wheel? His answer was "not from loss of blood, but from gangrene, and probably on the third day." But if we take a different translation, the difficulty is obviated. The Greek word ἆιρειν, *tollere*, as it occurs in the Greek and in the Latin Vulgate, signifies also to "kill." I then translate it thus, "that the bones should be broken, and that they should be killed," or, "that after the bones had been broken, they should be killed." The mode of putting to death would be, as I conceive, from a spear being directed straight to the heart; but as their sufferings would be so far abridged by this mode, whilst in the other case, they would live in inexpressible pain, and with intolerable thirst, for three, nay perhaps for seven days, their bones were previously broken, in order to substitute a sharp and violent death for the longer pain, from which they were now relieved.

"*For that sabbath day was an high day.*"] I am aware that some manuscripts read "for the day of this sabbath," but I have preferred the common reading, as most in conformity with recognised editions, and in either case the grammar of the sentence is equally applicable.

33, 34. When they see that Jesus is dead, they do not give themselves the trouble of breaking his legs, because he could feel no pain from it; but one amongst them executes his main commission, by piercing his side in such a manner, as necessarily to cause death, in case he had not been dead already. These verses are loaded with many ignorant and feeble comments. Some have even endeavoured to ascertain the name of the soldier, and some have even given it, although not mentioned by John. Some say, he pierced him through malice, others from curiosity to know if he was dead. My opinion is, he acted in obedience to his orders, which were that the crucified persons should be put to death, and as this could not be effected by merely breaking the bones, he was to pierce the heart for that purpose. Some commentators have found out, that the Greek word νύσσω signifies "to tickle," and not "to pierce;" but these comments are unworthy of the New Tes-

tament. Suidas says distinctly, that the Greek word νύξαι signifies piercing a person or thing, close to you, with a sword or dagger. As I feel myself under the necessity of mentioning the various conjectures, which have been brought forward, in order that the reader may not accuse me of suppressing any thing, I shall here notice a singular various reading, as it occurs in the Vulgate. It is thus translated, "he opened his side with a lance," which Beza concludes to have been a confusion of some other Greek word (ἤνοιξε). Certain it is, that the word "opened" is in Wheeler's Manuscript, and it occurs in the new Syriac translation. The old Latin translations, prior to Jerome, are divided.

34. "*And forthwith came thereout blood and water.*"] If the direction of the spear was intended to terminate life, and was therefore aimed at the heart, it could only have produced blood, and what the physicians term "liquor pericardii," from the heart, and the contiguous vessels. This is the common opinion, but to make it better understood, I must recur to something which is generally omitted. The "liquor pericardii" is, in general, in such small quantities, that its effusion is scarcely evident; but when the death is slow, and even in the case of a

person who is hung, it accumulates rapidly, as well as in all the pectoral vessels, besides the pericardium: and as Jesus had now suffered six hours upon the cross, it must have accumulated so considerably as to become visible. In one point of view, this wound, and the blood and water which flowed from it, are important; they prove the death of Jesus Christ, and that it was not merely a fainting fit, but that it was in the state of death, that he was put into the grave. This proof, however, becomes stronger, when we take into consideration my illustration of the word "taken away." If the object was merely to take away life, the blow would naturally have been aimed at the heart, and the blood and water flowing out would have been the fatal and immediate consequence. But John does not seem to have written this history, however important this fact ultimately becomes, with this object in view; he makes no application of it, as verifying the death of Jesus, but only looks to it, as fulfilling a material passage in Scripture. He does not even hint at the possibility of Jesus being buried alive; and it is not likely he understood so much of the formation of the human frame as to know the effect of the effusion of the "liquor pericardii," and

it is not probable, that many even of his learned commentators were acquainted with the physical consequences. The case would have been different if Luke had related it, as he was a medical man, and is likely to have been conversant with the effect of blood and water issuing in this direction.

35, 36. There is nothing, so far as I can understand the words of John, more clear, than that he here speaks of the actual fulfilment of such passages of the Old Testament, as related prophetically to the Messiah. But it is not here an object to strain passages, or to accommodate them to the situation, to which he conceived they might apply. I will not confine myself to the expression, "For these things were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled," because that might have another meaning, but to the connection. The history, in the eyes of John, acquires such singular importance, that he says, he writes as an eye-witness, that he has seen every thing himself, and that he knows it to be true; and he writes that his reader may believe that Jesus is the Christ. But in what way does it contribute to this belief? to convince any one, that Jesus was actually dead, and actually risen? It does both; but he

alludes to it, in another way, and merely says, "For this is done, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." The history, therefore, is important: first, as producing an active faith in Christ; and next, as illustrating two passages in the Old Testament, which John necessarily understood to relate to Christ. It is astonishing how some commentators have tortured this passage. Men, who do not believe in types (although in other places, they will believe them, nor is there any thing inconsistent in ceremonies, ordained by God, having a signification), will not believe that the passage, Exodus xii. 46, about the Paschal Lamb, relates to the Messiah: they will not believe that the passage, Zechariah xii. 10, relates to him, although the passage, taken in connection with the one immediately preceding it, is so obscure, that a man who had learned to doubt, would prefer declaring that he did not understand it. But let them think of these passages what they like, and give even the most decisive opinion, what would be the consequence? what would a reasonable man say, in reference to these passages? The utmost he could say, would be, that John had made an erroneous application of the passage. This does not affect the credibility of John, but

only impeaches the doctrine of general divine inspiration, which must, of course, be renounced, if these prophecies do not attach to the Messiah. But this the commentators will not do, and they introduce an explanation, which, instead of admitting the possibility of mistake, involves an intentional absurdity. But here every Jew, deist, and infidel, can judge for himself, whether, supposing the two passages to be prophecies, unconnected with this history, John has erred, or whether he has rightly quoted them in illustration of a singular coincidence.

36. I must think that John refers to Christ, when we look to the passage in Exodus xii. 46, and I think that the sacrifices ordained by Moses are rightly explained in the Old Testament (Psalm xl. 6—9) to be an emblem of the great and true sacrifice, which God requires, and at the same time, of the Messiah, who speaks in this psalm. In Luke xxiv. 27, I must also observe that what Jesus explains to be prophetic of his death, evidently refers to the commandment of Moses in relation to bloody sacrifices, and I am astonished that any should agree with me in the illustration of this passage, and yet deny the Paschal Lamb to be a type of Christ, and the quotation to be only a forced application of it

The Paschal Lamb, according to Moses, is the highest sacrifice, and whatever relates to sacrifices in general, must apply to that of the Paschal Lamb in detail. In many passages of the New Testament, which are not in themselves perfectly clear, it is held forth as the type of Christ (1 Cor. v. 7,) and according to my judgment also in John vi. 4, 51—58, 63, as well as in i. 29. Here it strikes John, that a collateral circumstance, which was ordained on account of the Easter Lamb, had shown itself in the case of Christ, namely, that as it was to be eaten in one house, and no part of it taken into another house, Moses commanded no bone of it to be broken, and that consequently, when Pilate gave orders for the bones of the crucified persons to be broken, Providence prevented, in an unexpected manner, the execution of this order upon the person of Christ. In the common edition of the New Testament the words run thus, "a bone of him shall not be broken." In the Septuagint it stands, "and ye shall break no bone of him." But, according to another reading, for which Wetstein quotes high authority, it approaches nearer to the Septuagint. This was likewise the Latin version, prior to Jerome. There is this difference, the Septuagint says

"Ye shall not break;" John says, "it shall not be broken;" it may be that he expressed the sense, without adhering literally to the words. The Latin translations of John seem to have been copied from the Septuagint, but as it stands in no Greek manuscript, I can only suppose him, in deviating from the Septuagint, to have quoted under the impression of the sense. It has been a favourite notion with some that John does not quote this passage in allusion to the Paschal Lamb, but in allusion to a passage in the Psalms xxxiv. 20, which conforms to the Greek, "He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken." This passage certainly approximates in one word, "broken," to the text of John, a circumstance of little moment, as John does not always follow the Septuagint, and the words are in other respects different, but it is inapplicable as relating to the fact itself. It relates, according to the inscription of the Psalm, not to Christ, but to David, when he fortunately escaped from Gath; if we admit David to have been a type of Christ, he could not have been, in this case, a type of Christ suffering upon the cross, as he escaped the greatest personal danger, and returned from Gath uninjured. The sense is also different;

in the Psalm, it says "thou preservest all his bones, that not one of them shall be broken," which is as much as to say that "thou preservest him from all species of injury whatever." To apply these to a person dying upon the cross, and whose bones were not broken, because he was dead already, would be much the same quibble as if a man was promised a safe conduct, with the assurance that not a hair of his head should be injured, and yet be afterwards executed, with the accompanying care that the hair should be kept in perfectly good order.

37. This passage occurs Zechariah ii. 10, and is quoted not from the Septuagint, but from the Hebrew. The first translates it "and they shall look upon me, instead of their having danced." It is plain to me they have made some mistake in the Hebrew, but this does not affect my statement. John in this place, as he has done in others, gives his own translation of the Hebrew text, and it was here indispensable, because, according to the Septuagint, the translation would have been unintelligible. It is now my duty to compare it with the Hebrew, and the more so, because this has never been done in a satisfactory manner, and indeed, could not have been done so, previous to the year 1781. As the

Deity speaks in the preceding text, it could scarcely have been translated "they shall look upon me, whom they have pierced;" but rather "they shall look upon me with him, whom they pierced;" that is, they shall fix their eyes and their hopes upon me, and upon him whom they have pierced. The latter person might certainly be the Messiah; but John does not so translate it, but "they shall look upon him whom they have pierced." There had been long an opinion that John read the Hebrew in this way, and I made known to the learned world, from two Erfurt manuscripts, and on many satisfactory grounds, that such reading existed. (Oriental Library, p. 210.) But what are *two* manuscripts in the decision of an important inquiry? The last time, therefore, I gave a course of lectures upon this subject in 1777, I own I had my doubts; but the case is now different, since the publication of the second part of Kennicott's Hebrew Bible. The multiplicity of manuscripts decides in favour of my supposition, and that John, in deviating from the Septuagint, still retained the original sense. The question now, however, is "Does this passage of Zechariah relate to Christ?" Not to adopt the revolting and decisive tone which I have blamed in others,

I make two questions of it. "Does it actually relate to Christ?" and "Does it not relate to him?" To answer this decisively would be answering precipitately, unless we at once admitted the infallibility of John; we understand the last chapter of Zechariah (the most difficult of the prophets) much too little; and no commentator has hitherto been satisfactory. But if the question is confined to this, "Does the passage relate to Christ, or is it a palpable error, when John applies it to Christ?" I answer to the first, "Yes; it can easily relate, and probably does relate to Christ." It has been said, it cannot relate to Christ, because in the preceding text the times of the Maccabees constitute the subject. I admit in the chapter which precedes, but in the eleventh chapter the prophet advances into later times (v. 5 and 6,) and contemplates the injustice of the Asmonæan dynasty subsequent to Alexander Iannæus, and, finally, the tyrannical government of Herod. But I have not room to enter upon it here. The beginning of the twelfth chapter, which has no connection with the eleventh, does not appear to me to coincide with the history of the Maccabees. Indeed, I should say distinctly the reverse; I conjecture, therefore, that it relates to

another history, or is not yet fulfilled. But supposing another to be of a different opinion, and to conceive himself capable of reconciling the striking contradictions between this prophecy and the history of the Maccabees, he will still admit that his illustration of a text, hitherto so little understood, is mere conjecture, and that he has no right, therefore, positively to assert that the prophecy quoted by John does not relate to Christ. I shall not dwell more upon this subject; an illustration of the most difficult chapter of the most difficult and the least understood of all the prophets is not to be mixed up with an investigation into the history of the burial and resurrection of Jesus. What I have to say upon the subject, I have already said, in my Commentaries upon Zechariah, and to them I refer my young readers.

II. The Burial of Jesus.

Matth. xxvii. 57—61. Mark xv. 42—47.
Luke xxiii. 50—56. John xix. 38—42.

Matth. xxvii. 57—61.

57. "*When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus's disciple.*

58. "*He went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered.*

59. "*And when Joseph had taken the body he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth,*

60. "*And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock, and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed.*

61. "*And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre.*"

---

57. "*When the even was come.*"] As this word frequently occurs in the history of the burial and the resurrection, and not always in the same sense, and has, at times, occasioned misunderstanding, I must observe, once for all, that in Greek, and still more in Hebrew, it has a double meaning. The time from three o'clock in the afternoon to sunset, is named evening, and signifies much the same as vespers in certain parts of Germany. The time also from sunset to complete darkness, probably from six to nine or ten o'clock, is called evening. They have, therefore, a first and second evening. According to the popular use of the word in our own country, we may easily understand this; only that as we have longer days in summer, we begin the evening in summer later; but with

respect to its use in the Hebrew language, I intend saying more when I shall publish my collections for the Hebrew Lexicon. In this passage the word " evening" is decidedly taken in the first sense, namely, from about four to six; for Jesus died soon after three, and the Sabbath commenced with sunset, that is, in the month of April, soon after six o'clock; this is, in fact, the real meaning of the Greek word. Julius Pollux writes, b. i. ch. 69, " when the sun declines (which it does sensibly from three o'clock) it is then the evening of the day," using here the same Greek word ὀψὲ for " evening," as the Greek translator of Matthew. Our passage here, therefore, is easy, others will follow, that will be more difficult.

" *There came a rich man of Arimathea named Joseph.*"] That Arimathea is the same city which, in the Old Testament is called Ramathaim, and where Samuel was born, (1 Sam. i. 1.) is tolerably ascertained; but, on the contrary, it is a great mistake, if we confound it with Ramla or Ramula, a much younger city. This Ramathaim lay, according to the first book of Samuel i. 1, in Mount Ephraim; consequently, it has created some surprise that it should be here described as a Jewish city, (although Luke

expressly states it xxiii. 51,) as it rather ought to have belonged to the Samaritans. The case in which great geographers seem to differ is this; when Palestine, after the death of Alexander the Great, fell under the Egyptian yoke, three districts of Samaria, Ephraim, Lydda, and Ramathaim were appropriated to Judæa, and after the victories of the Maccabees, the Syrian kings confirmed it. These three districts were attached always to the Jews. See 1 Maccabees xi. 28, and my observations.

The expression "Joseph of Arimathea," is generally understood that Joseph was one of the high council, and resident at Jerusalem, but that Arimathea was his birth-place. It does not, I confess, strike me in the same light, as all the four evangelists use the word "of Arimathea." They are not in the habit of noting exclusively all the Jews from the place of their birth, therefore I conclude, from the words "Joseph of Arimathea," (and I shall make it more evident from Mark) that he was resident at Arimathea—was a counsellor there—and not invested with the high situation which has been assigned to him of belonging to the Sanhedrim of Jerusalem. I mention this in the outset, because it has a great influence upon the history

of the resurrection of Jesus, and affects notions, which have been generally received. When it is said, "there came," we are not to understand, that he came that evening from Arimathea to Jerusalem. This would have been inconsistent, for as this was the first day of the Passover, he must have been at Jerusalem the evening before, and have eaten the Paschal Lamb in the night. But "there came," frequently occurs in Hebrew narrative, and was probably so placed by Matthew in the original. Mark also, who had this original before him, retains it, but he averts the ambiguity of the Greek translation, and writes, chap. xv. 43, translating literally "Joseph came, he of Arimathea."

"*A disciple of Jesus.*"] One who heard, believed in, and honoured him.

58. My readers will not here expect from me, that I should repeat what others have collected from Roman jurisprudence relative to the permitted or prohibited interment of criminals. It belongs not to this place. Malefactors must have been buried in Palestine, as the reverse would have been too obvious an infraction of the Mosaic law, which the Roman authorities conceded to the Jews. The two

who were crucified with Jesus, were without doubt buried before the evening expired, for they were put to death, that their bodies might not lie all night upon the cross. The acquiescence of Pilate did not consist in permitting the body of Jesus to be buried, but in giving it up to Joseph, that he might bury him at his own discretion.

59. "*A clean linen cloth.*"] The Greek word σινδόνι, has different meanings, which do not apply here; as for instance, where it relates to clothing the living, instead of, as here, wrapping the dead. A passage to this effect, has been quoted by Wetstein, but without comment. Herodotus says, book ii. chap. 86, speaking of the Egyptians, "they wrapped up the embalmed body in cotton linen, cut into long strips." That I have translated βύσσινος, "cotton," with propriety, is shown in professor Forster's book upon Byssus, who remarks, that our Egyptian mummies are not wrapped up in linen, but in a cotton garment, or rather calico, and that the Greek word "sindon" for linen, is originally Egyptian. I understand this so far as it relates to Egypt, but here there was no incision, but merely embalming according to the custom of the Jews.

The dead body was wrapped up in fine cotton or chintz. The expression "wrapping up" and "linen" is common to the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and as they coincide in this, I believe it to apply not to the regular cloth, in which the dead were, properly speaking, enveloped, but to these wrappers. John alone uses another expression, which makes the case still stronger, and which I will endeavour to explain. From John xi. 44, it seems it was the fashion to wrap the rich in bandages, exactly according to the Eyyptian custom, every foot and hand separately, so that Lazarus, although he was wrapped up in bandages, could still walk. But it may be asked, what "clean linen" means? For it is not probable that Matthew would inform us, which is in itself intelligible without his information, that the rich Joseph would not wrap up the dead body in dirty linen. This word has been generally overlooked by commentators. I believe, that, in that ambiguous word "sindon," which, as Forster observes, is common both to linen and to cotton, it is confined to the last, for cotton garments were clean both to Egyptians and to Jews, and, I might almost

say, sacred, since with both people the priests clothed themselves in calico, and not in linen. It is for this reason, I prefer my own interpretation of the word "a burial cloth" to the Lutheran and to the common translation of the word "clean linen." When Luther translated the Bible, he could not have known this.

Matthew says nothing of the spices, which were wrapped up with the body of Jesus. As this silence, as well as that of Mark and Luke, has been considered by the adversaries of the christian religion, as an argument against the fact, I hope I may be allowed to make a few observations upon this place.

1. The enemies of Christianity contend that there is great inconsistency in Mark and Luke relating the fact of the women bringing spices, and intending to embalm Jesus on our Sunday morning, and at the same time omitting what is related by John, of Joseph and Nicodemus having already wrapped up the body of Jesus with spices, when they interred him. This ceases to be, in point of fact, remarkable, when we consider, that Matthew, although he describes the wrapping, says nothing of the women having brought spices, or of their having

intended to embalm the body early on our Sunday morning. He is perfectly silent with respect to spices and embalming.

2. Where Mark omits, what Matthew omits, for the gospel of Matthew was in the hands of Mark, it does not render Mark in any degree more suspicious than Matthew.

60. "*In his own new tomb, which he had hewn out, in the rock.*"] A doubt here occurs to me which has not yet been noticed by our commentators, nor seems to have attracted the remarks of the enemies of Christianity; the latter always reason, as if Jesus had been placed in the grave of Joseph. If the objection has not been made, it is a proof that their acuteness and acrimony are not equal. According to the language of Matthew, it is evident, that the grave of Jesus was the property of Joseph of Arimathea. This circumstance is not mentioned by any other evangelist, and there is something improbable in the thing itself. According to Mark, Joseph was a counsellor of Arimathea—how comes he to have his own sepulchre hewn in a rock at Jerusalem? and the more so, because the Jews were not in the habit, as we are, of transporting our dead, but of burying them immediately

after their decease. He who reads John will not easily believe it was the separate property of Joseph, but only used on account of its proximity, and near approach to the Sabbath. John says, " Now in the place, where he was crucified, there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepuchre, wherein was never yet man laid; there laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews' preparation day (Friday), for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." I confess, that in this main point, there is, according to my translation of it, an inconsistency between Matthew and John, but yet so, that the case itself, and the other evangelists determine it, in favour of John. In Matthew there are two various readings, which give a new construction to the thing, and adapt it to the translation of Mark, " laid him in a sepulchre, which was hewn out of a rock." The various readings are these:

1. " His own," (αὐτοῦ) is omitted in the Winchelsea manuscript, which is a very important one, and we cannot suppose that this was done to avoid the inconsistency, because it has still the words, " which he had hewn out, in the rock," and this leaves the property in Joseph of Arimathea. Mark, who had the

Hebrew gospel of Matthew before him, and at times confined himself to translation, does not use the word, "his own."

2. The old Syriac translation has "was hewn out," for "he had hewn out," and the new Syriac translation has the same version in the margin, a proof, that the marginal reading was not from the old Syriac, but from Greek manuscripts of the sixth century. It gains additional importance from its coincidence with Mark, who so generally follows Matthew.

The probability therefore, is, that the authorised version is incorrect, and that the original reading is, "in *a* new tomb, which had been hewn out in a rock." But supposing this reading not to be acquiesced in, the following will be the result. We have not Matthew in the original Hebrew, but only a Greek translation, which may be, from the very nature of translation, in itself, defective. In the original Hebrew, it must have been different, for Mark possessed and read it, and he writes, "laid him in a sepulchre, which was hewn out of a rock." The translator, (for every one, accustomed to translation, knows the extreme difficulty of preserving the perfect sense of the

original,) probably considered it to be Joseph's own grave, and by introducing the word "his own," gave rise to a belief which John, whose gospel was not known to the translator of Matthew, finding in the Greek copies, mildly corrects. The following may be considered as trifling, but they are the laborious, and at times, erroneous conclusions of learned philologists. The word we translate "hewn out" signifies also to "wall up," and "a rock" signifies also "stones." Salmasius, and afterwards Krebs, have both observed this from the modern Greek, and from a passage in Josephus. The remark is not of much importance, so far as it relates to that which is now shown as the holy sepulchre, but for which we have no authentic guarantee, although hewn out of a rock, and consisting of square stones. The comment, however, is true, so far as it applies to Mark, but not, as it applies to Matthew, for with him it is "in the rock." Of course, it means not stones, which made the wall of "the tomb," but "the rock, in which it was hewn." I should prefer the illustration of the Septuagint, written in the Greek of the New Testament, and where, in the case of sepulchres, it says, Isaiah xxii. 16, "What hast

thou here? and whom hast thou here? that thou hast hewn thee out a sepulchre here, as he that heweth him out a sepulchre on high, and that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock?" We know, from travellers, that in Palestine, graves were frequently worked into the rocks, like grottoes, and that they subsequently served, as asylums to hermits and to robbers. A very unnecessary doubt has arisen upon the use of the article, whether it should not be "a rock," and if not, what rock? In German the question is easily answered, but in English we frequently say, "cut out of the rock," as applying to rocks generally. But to inquire into the locality of the rock, is to inquire into the locality of Golgotha, of which the only certainty is, that it is not the one now pointed out as the place of crucifixion. The whole neighbourhood of Jerusalem is so rocky, as easily to afford an excavated sepulchre in its vicinity. The word (καινῷ κενῷ) "new," has in one important manuscript (Reüchlen) another reading, "empty," of which a Greek, and especially a modern Greek reader, will immediately perceive the reason, from the similarity of pronunciation; it has, however, a

great influence on the sense. Chrysostom, who is quoted for this reading, says, "that as Joseph was thrown into an *empty* pit, and taken out again without injury, so was Jesus buried in an *empty* grave and rose again on the third day." He may have been deceived by the similarity of sound, although he might fairly use it, since Luke xxiii. 53, very strongly confirms this explanation.

"*Rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre.*"] This is alone mentioned by Matthew, and by his follower Mark, probably because Matthew wished to add the circumstance of the high priest's having sealed the stone; nor is the silence of Luke and John any contradiction to it, because Luke xxiv. 2, and John xx. 1, both allude to the stone being rolled away, either from a Jewish custom, or from the presumption, that it was known to have been previously sealed and guarded. When this happened, it was the first day of Easter, which, according to Exodus xii. 16, was a Sabbath; a person, fond of doubting, might here say, "Could Joseph envelope Jesus for burial on the first day of Easter? Could he bury him? Could he roll the stone before

the door of the sepulchre?" The answer is easy; Joseph did not do this himself, but others might do it, under his directions, and those, who have lived with Jews in the same city, know that they employ people to do for them on the Sabbath day, that labour, which they consider forbidden in their own persons. Joseph might do this, therefore, through men, who were not Jews. But, besides this, the first day of Easter is not such a complete sabbath, as the weekly Sabbath. It was permitted, as indeed appears from the passage I have quoted, to prepare food on that day. To inter a dead body, previous to the coming of the weekly Sabbath, was considered by the Jews, as a work of necessity, and therefore, for this purpose, an infringement upon the feast-day, was a due respect paid to the weekly Sabbath. Even where there is no coincidence of the two Sabbaths, (the weekly Sabbath, or the festival,) our Jews make no scruple of burying the dead who have died upon the first day of Easter, but they do not consider burial to be allowed upon the weekly Sabbath, or our Saturday.

MARK XV. 42—47.

42. "*And now, when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath,*

43. "*Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus.*

44. "*And Pilate marvelled, if he were already dead; and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him, whether he had been any while dead.*

45. "*And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.*

46. "*And he brought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre, which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.*

47. "*And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses, beheld where he was laid.*"

42. "*Because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath.*"] Mark explains this denomination of Friday to his readers, because he wrote at Rome, where this word might not have been generally known, although Augustus, as I before observed, had used it in an edict.

"*Of Arimathea.*"] I have shewn from Matthew, that this does not mean his coming from Arimathea, but that he was of that place,

which the article "he of Arimathea," used by Mark, explains very clearly.

"*Honourable.*"] The Greek word has three significations, which all apply to Joseph "rich, respectable, virtuous." I prefer "rich," because Matthew, whom Mark generally follows, calls him so. It has been said, that the unlearned translate the word into the two first meanings, the learned into the last. In this respect, I think the saying wrong, but it is of no great import, because Mark is the least refined Greek writer in the New Testament.

"*Counsellor.*"] It is a received opinion, that Joseph of Arimathea was a member of the sanhedrim of Jerusalem; I own this does not appear to me probable. If I read in a Roman author, "Sempronius of Capua, an eminent counsellor," I should not suppose he was a counsellor of Rome, but of Capua; why should I think otherwise of Joseph of Arimathea? but the word "counsellor" applied both by Luke and Mark to Joseph, is applied to no other in the New Testament; the members of the sanhedrim are frequently mentioned, but always in a different way. It is rarely used to express a dignity, except in the Septuagint (Job iii. 14, and xli. 17.) It would seem to

apply to a city more than a nation, and the letters of Pliny give it to the civic counsel in the cities of Asia. From the Greek, it travelled into the Asiatic languages, so that Joseph may have had this distinction in his own. The old Syriac translation retains it, and the Jews use it for the great officers of a city, but not for the great council of a nation. The circumstance of all the evangelists calling him Joseph of Arimathea, makes me think him to have been counsellor of that place, or perhaps of the adjoining district. This supposition has been opposed upon a passage in Luke xxiii. 51, but the authority of Luke speaking humanly, who wrote from tradition and inquiry, is not to be considered as valuable as Mark's whose home was in Palestine. But more of this hereafter.

"*Which also waited for the kingdom of God.*"] He believed Jesus to be the Messiah, and expected his kingdom soon to begin. Upon this he would probably have as erroneous notions, as the apostles themselves. Some have translated it, "who received the word of God," but, as the Jews actually expected the kingdom of the Messiah, and it was represented as approaching in the discourses of

Christ, and of John, I prefer the ordinary translation.

"*Went in boldly.*"] There was no necessity to use this boldness with respect to Pilate, who, in his judgment seat, had not conducted himself with hostility to Jesus, but it required some courage to act in direct opposition to the high priest, and the whole sanhedrim, and to solicit the privilege of giving an honourable burial to him, whom they had just crucified as an impostor. There is some trifling attention due to this reading. The common one stands thus, "Came and went in boldly." Some manuscripts have it, "Joseph having come, he dared and went in;" some few "Joseph came and having dared, went in." But both appear to have suffered from transcribers.

44. "*Marvelled if he were already dead.*"] A crucified man dies not quickly—he generally remains alive to the third day. This we are not acquainted with, because this horrible mode of punishment is not in use amongst us, but in the mind of a Roman governor, it was a natural reflection. I find several learned men have been desirous of giving another illustration to this passage, and think it surprising Pilate should have had any doubt upon the

subject. There are some passages, I allow, but they are few in number, in which the word "if" is not introduced in a doubting manner. But I see no reason why the text should be thus tortured, for if Pilate was only a moderately reasonable man, he may have well doubted the existence of the fact, as the Jew was unknown to him, and he, who could have begged for the body of Jesus, must have been a warm disciple. Would, for instance, any prudent magistrate deliver to the friend of the crucified person, the body for interment, which, according to experience, ought to have lived at least until the ensuing morning, without making more accurate inquiries into the truth of his death? I know that it has been said, that Pilate did not inquire of the Centurion, whether he was really dead, but whether he had long been dead, assuming the fact of his death, as either known to him, or probable. Putting out of all question, the Complutensian, the Cambridge, and another manuscript, quoted by Erasmus, all of which use the word "already," and the belief that Pilate might have in the truth and earnestness of Joseph, I will only remark, that Pilate asks whether he had been any time dead? For if he had been but a short time dead, he might

conceive it was only a fainting fit, and not actual death. I am aware this is but a trifle, but the minutiæ, into which learned men descend, force me into it. There is, however, a difficulty which, I find, generally overlooked. How could Pilate, who, according to John xix. 31, 37, had ordered the bones of the crucified persons to be broken, preparatory to giving them the fatal blow, be astonished that Jesus was dead, doubt the fact, and call upon the Centurion to report the real case to him? The doubt would certainly be inexplicable if we read the evangelists, as we read the minute transactions of a diary, and if we concluded from John xix. 38, writing "after this," that Joseph had obtained access to Pilate, subsequent to the order being given for the breaking of the bones. But it is not thus that we read histories, compiled by others, and indeed no historian would venture such an accuracy of detail. It would be more in character, with astronomical precision. In a general view, the case would appear to stand thus; Jesus dies between three and four in the afternoon; Joseph immediately goes to Pilate, and requests the dead body; Pilate doubts the fact of his being dead, and orders the Centurion to be called. The Jews soon afterwards appear

and beg that the crucified persons may be killed, and their bodies taken down before sunset. Pilate orders this, and before the body of Jesus is actually taken down, the soldiers come and execute these orders. Joseph of Arimathea, and the Jews who came to make the request, as above, may not have had more than a quarter of an hour's difference between them. But supposing you reverse the case, and that the application of the Jews preceded that of Joseph, it would then stand thus; Pilate would be astonished at the death of Jesus, as hearing it from Joseph, when the order for the bones being broken could not have been carried into execution; he suspects Joseph of an intention of taking away Jesus, previous to his being dead, and orders the Centurion to be called.

"*Whether he had been any while dead.*"] In order to be certain it was actual death, and not merely a fainting fit, produced by extreme pain. Instead of this, the Cambridge manuscript reads, "whether he was already dead?" Erasmus speaks as if the same reading existed in other manuscripts, but with which we are unacquainted. Were these, however, Greek or Latin manuscripts? In a Latin translation, previous to Jerome, I have found something of

the kind as in that of Corvey. Those of Branchino are here defective. But I consider the reading to be wrong.

45. "*He gave the body to Jesus.*"] Wetstein has here a remark which, as applied to Pilate, I think unjust, and unreasonable. "We may here observe," says he, "the morals of Pilate, which were distinguished for their avarice." There can be no doubt that Pilate was avaricious, but I cannot see how the circumstance of his giving the body to Joseph, that is, for nothing, and without ransom can be quoted against him for avarice. Supposing the word "gave" not to bear so literal an interpretation, but that Pilate had received some remuneration for it, still it is not mentioned by any evangelist, and, therefore, no commentator has a right to infer it. I would rather take the opportunity of repeating, what Premontval has so judiciously remarked, that Pilate in no part of his history, which is come down to us, appears to such advantage, as in his connection with the sufferings of Jesus. He condemned Jesus from fear, but the disciples, who relate it, do so with much impartiality and mildness, so that he appears better in this unjust transaction, than in those parts which are handed down to us by Josephus,

who certainly was not favourable to him. This shows, that the evangelists did not write from feelings of party or of passion—a very extraordinary circumstance in any historian.

LUKE XXIII. 50—55.

50. "*And behold, there was a man, named Joseph, a counsellor, he was a good man, and a just;*

51. "*The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them, he was of Arimathea, a city of the Jews; who also himself waited for the kingdom of God.*

52. "*This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.*

53. "*And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre, that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid.*

54. "*And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on.*

55. "*And the women also, which came with him, from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid.*"

51. "*The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them.*"] This is the passage from which it has been inferred that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim, at Jerusalem. I cannot say that this is an inevitable inference. It may be said of a man who disapproves the conduct of his own nation, even though he is not a member of the highest council in the

country, that "his not consenting" is only a gentler mode of saying, "he disapproved," and is not uncommon in ordinary life. Wetstein has shown that the word is not judicial; and indeed, if Joseph had been a member of the High Council, I should rather have expected the words, "he had not given his vote," unless indeed, in such an assembly, he had been deterred by fear from attending.

54. "*And that day was the preparation.*"] That is to say, Friday. The Cambridge manuscript reads, "and it was the day before the sabbath." Now although this is an evident comment, or marginal interpretation, which has crept into the text, yet it shows the meaning which commentators attached to the word "preparation."

"*And the sabbath drew on.*"] This is a Syriasm, which I have amply illustrated in my introduction to the New Testament.

JOHN XIX. 38—42.

38. "*And after this, Joseph of Arimathea, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate, that he might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him leave. He came, therefore, and took the body of Jesus.*

39. "*And there came also Nicodemus, which, at the first,*

came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pounds weight.

40. *" Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.*

41. *" Now in the place, where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden, a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid.*

42. *" There laid they Jesus, therefore, because of the Jews preparation day, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand."*

John proceeds in his own manner to relate what his predecessors have related before him, and to add circumstances, which, as an eye-witness, came within his knowledge, and tend to make the history clearer.

38. *" And after this."*] We must not understand this to be an exact register, by quarters of hours, and by minutes, of what occurred subsequent to the breaking of the bones of the two thieves, and the piercing of Jesus, for it might then have been too late to go to Pilate, as the bodies were immediately afterwards taken down, but to be confined solely to the actual history after the death of Jesus. When Joseph saw that Jesus was actually dead, he went to Pilate, and begged the body.

39. A commentary entirely in the manner of John. The other evangelists either knew no-

thing of Nicodemus, who is not here a principal person, but who comes to bring spices, and do honour to his burial, or they intentionally suppress the name to prevent any personal inconvenience. The same applies to Lazarus, whose life might have been endangered, if the enemies of Jesus knew that such a proof of the resurrection was in their immediate neighbourhood. The name of Peter also, as having cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, is probably suppressed from the same cause. The last supposition is to me the most probable. Nicodemus may have been from fear, a *private* disciple of Jesus, for although his name is honourably mentioned in the Talmud, he never appears in the Acts of the Apostles as the public defender of Christianity, nor does he even venture as far as Gamaliel, Acts v. 34, 39. Whether he was right does not affect my argument; but the fact is so, and it would have been, perhaps, indiscreet to have dragged him by name from his privacy. But, after his death, and after the destruction of Jerusalem, John might mention his name without scruple, especially as he wrote at Ephesus, and in the Greek language. The Talmud, in mentioning the name of Nicodemus with respect says merely, that Bonai, (the

Jewish name of Nicodemus) was considered to be a disciple of Jesus. Nicodemus showed himself a friend of Jesus as other good men were to Stephen, and provided for his burial; (Acts viii. 2,) the burial was always reckoned amongst the Jews a good work. (Tobit i. 17—19, ii. 4—8, iv. 17, xii. 12, 13.) But afterwards, when the persecutions became more violent against the Christians, he appears to have been passive, and, probably, did not attend the meetings of the Sanhedrim, for we should otherwise have met with his name in the Acts of the Apostles.

39. "*Aloes*"] Not the Aloes of the shops, but the Indian, the tree of which emits a very pleasant fragrance.

"*Hundred pounds' weight*"] We do not know what the libra or pound is in the original. It has been generally translated "pounds," and then doubts have been raised upon the word, and upon the quantity. Some have supposed such a quantity to have been unnecessary. But this is not my doubt! I question whether "pounds" is the right translation; it is worth while to examine it, as it occurs only here and at John xii. 3. One commentator generally follows the labours of his predecessor, and weights and measures do not enter the minds

of those whose study it is to explain words. The translation arises probably from the Vulgate, which retains the Latin word "libra," as well, as in the Latin versions made before Jerome. But this is not the case with the very old versions; nor with the old Syriac, the Philoxenian, and the two Arabic versions. We might almost imagine the Greek word "litra" to have been copied into the Latin, and by an easy transition the Latin word "libra" to have been adopted as a necessary result. I can scarcely fancy it to have been a pound; it is used solely by John, and in speaking of weights and measures at Jerusalem, we should suppose he meant the weights and measures in use amongst the Jews, as the appropriate Hebrew word occurs in the Talmud. I conclude them, therefore, to be Jewish weights. The Jews had no pounds, but shekels, minas, and talents; and we are not accustomed to sell spices by pounds, but by drams and ounces; and, besides, in the Talmud it is not a pound, but the twenty-fourth part of a pound. Buxtorf has the place in his Lexicon. But how came the Jews to have the Roman libra? We can conceive the *B* to be changed into a *T* more easily in copying than in speaking. But Julius Pollux will show us it

is originally a Sicilian word; it is not likely, therefore, to have been borrowed from the Latin, or to have been synonimous with it; for we know that the Sicilians did not borrow their geometrical knowledge or their technical words from the Romans, who learnt in their island the existence of such a science as mathematics. I do not contend, but I think it probable, that the word is oriental, and that it comes from the Syriac and the Talmud, for there were formerly great Phœnician and Carthaginian colonies in Sicily; Phœnician was the language in use, and some old Sicilian coins, now extant, are Phœnician. The Sicilian name of a weight (for the Phœnicians were merchants, who naturally weigh their goods, and spread the name of their weights and measures,) might well, therefore, be Phœnician, and Phœnician is nothing more than Hebrew. If we then put away the word "pound" out of our consideration, and presume it to have been inserted from clerical error or insufficient knowledge, we may inquire what the Greek word "litra" means. Although "litra," according to Buxtorf, is equally applicable to weights and measures, yet, as this relates to weights only, I shall confine myself to them. If the name is Sicilian, we must look to Sicily

for explanation. Defective as our sources are, there is enough in Julius Pollux, b. iv. s. 173, to justify a credible inference. "The comic wri-"ters," says he, "call one stater, which makes two "drachmæ, a litra, for the word is in ordinary "use with the Sicilian comedians. Crates, in his "comedy of the Pledge, describes a hook which "was bought for five staters, as costing five litra. "The gold stater contained two Attic drachmæ. "The Doric comedians apply the word litra occa-"sionally to inferior coins. Sophron, in his fe-"male Mimics, says 'the reward is ten litra,' and "in the male Mimics, 'I have not even two litra "remaining.' Another time it is a measure, as "in Deinolochus, in the Medea, 'chains of forty "litra for the young man.'" Aristotle, in speaking of the republic of Agrigentum, in Sicily, observes, "they have a punishment of fifty litra, "and that litra is as much as the obolus of Ae-"gina." (The litra of Agrigentum would be consequently less, and only the sixth part of a drachma, but here it is not the name of a measure, but of a copper coin, and of its value.) In speaking of Himera, in Sicily, Aristotle continues, "They name two copper pennies Dixas; "one, an ounce; three, a trias; six, half a litra; "an obolus, a litra; the Corinthian stater, ten

" litra; because it is as much as ten oboli. Some " of the more recent Athenian comic writers, as " Philemon and Posidippus, use the word litra." It follows from this, that " litra" does not signify a pound, but two drachmæ, the eighth part of a pound, and that one hundred litra are two hundred drachmæ. The drachmæ themselves were of different quantities, but to which I cannot assign a determinate place, according to our measures; it is, perhaps, safest to calculate, according to the custom of our shops. Some litra were probably much smaller, as the Talmud litra was only one twenty-fourth part of a pound. He, who wishes to examine this more minutely should take his Talmud passages from Buxtorf, in preference to Wetstein, and by the application of mathematical and philological knowledge he will be enabled to come at very satisfactory results. But I have here digressed too much, and must reserve myself for other times.

40. " *Wound it in linen clothes, with the spices.*"] Jesus, therefore, was not, properly speaking, embalmed, for to this, incision was necessary, but merely enveloped in fragrant spices. What some commentators have said of burning incense is mere misapprehension, con-

nected with much credulity, arising from a passage in the Talmud. In the old Testament, "the burning of dead bodies with incense," particularly about the time of Isaiah, is frequently mentioned, but as the Jews during the time when the Talmud was written, conceived the burning of dead bodies to be heathenish and idolatrous, they explained the corresponding passages of the old Testament, by applying them to the sole custom of burning incense. They decidedly erred in this; for the Hebrews, in the time of Isaiah, did burn their dead; and then they commit a new error, and assume the fact of incense being burnt when that of wrapping up with fragant spices is alone mentioned.

"*As the manner of the Jews is to bury.*"] The Jewish mode of embalming is contrasted with the Egyptian, which lasted seventy days, and is described in the second book of Herodotus. The Egyptians filled the interior of the body with spices; but the Jews, who buried on the day of decease, only wrapped the body round in spices. Jacob was, however, embalmed according to Egyptian custom. Genesis l. 2. But we know nothing of the Jewish mode of embalming, except from the passage here quoted, and from 2 Chronicles xvi. 14, which relates to the burning of the

dead with spices. The original word in John, which we translate "to bury," has been held by some to be, "to prepare for burial." I know the word will bear this extended signification, and Kypke so explains it, Mark xiv. 8. but as the passage here relates to embalming, and occurs in the Septuagint three times, in this sense I confine myself to it. In Genesis l. 2, the Hebrew word is thus translated into Greek; in the new Testament it solely relates to embalming; and in Acts v. 6, the Greek word is different, and applies to burial only. In fact, translating "according to the manner of the Jews, when they prepare for interment" would be inconsistent, for the rich can only afford to envelope in spices, and the custom was so rare as not even to be described in the Talmud.*

* An exposition of Jewish laws and commentaries, subsequent to the birth of Christ. It consists of two parts: the Mischna and the Gamara. The origin of the Mischna was about two centuries after Christ. Rabbi Jude, surnamed the Saint, made himself particularly distinguished in this collection, and it was called the second law. Its object was to adapt the existing institutions of the Jews to the Mosaic dispensation. Subsequent Rabbis, and particularly the Rabbi Jochanen occupied themselves in the illustration of the Mischna, about 230 years after Christ; this gave rise to the Gamara. The two composed

41, 42. John does not any where say, that the grave belongs to Joseph; we must conclude the contrary, from his statement, and that it was only chosen on account of its vicinity. The grave does not seem, in the first instance, to have been destined for the reception of Jesus, and Joseph would probably have taken him, if there had been time before sunset, to a greater distance, but as a rich man, he easily obtained the accommodation of placing the dead body during the sabbath in an adjoining spot. It is impossible to say, to what place he would have taken him, and what he intended to do after the sabbath, or whether he meant the body to remain, indeed no evangelist mentions it, and for a very good reason, for he could not know it. The resurrection, however, of Jesus, becomes in a degree more credible, in proportion as we adopt this explanation of it, and suppose the dead body to have been placed in a sepulchre, only selected on account of its proximity. What John mentions in these verses, are mere additions to the three first evangelists; such, for instance,

the Talmud of Jerusalem, which was afterwards modified about 500 years after Christ, and is now best known as the Talmud of Babylon. I. D.

as the fact of the grave being in a garden. If the reader of the new Testament had previously understood Matthew, according to what we now read, that Joseph had laid him in his own grave, it becomes a mild correction of a pardonable error, committed not by Matthew himself, but by his Greek translator. John furnishes us with more instances where he gently obviates the possibility of misapprehension, arising from passages in the three first evangelists, which would otherwise, without him, have been obscure.

"*Because of the Jews' preparation day.*"] We should not translate this "on account of its being Friday," or as Luther has done "on account of the day of preparation of the Jews," but "while it was yet Friday, before the sun had set, and consequently before the sabbath had commenced."

III. Appointment of the watch at the grave of Jesus.

Matth. xxvii. 62—67.

62. "*Now, the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate,*

63. "*Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.*

64. "*Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first.*

65. "*Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as ye can.*

66. "*So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.*"

Matthew alone relates this history, probably as a prelude to that, which he relates in the subsequent chapter, of the current rumour that pervaded Jerusalem, and the consequent argument which it produced against the resurrection of Jesus, namely, that his disciples had, whilst the

guard were asleep, stolen the dead body, out of the grave, which was thus missing on the third day. The object of the narrative is, therefore, local, and intended to counteract a rumour, which had gone abroad in the city, and militated strongly against the truth of the resurrection. A person writing in Jerusalem and in the Hebrew language, could do this with propriety; the other evangelists, who wrote in places remote from Jerusalem, and where this rumour was unknown, had no reason to revive it, or even to mention the fact of the sepulchre having been guarded. Mark, therefore, who had the gospel of Matthew before him, and so scrupulously follows him, leaves this passage out; for as he wrote at Rome or Alexandria, he had no object in relating or answering reports prevalent at Jerusalem, but not perhaps even known in any other cities. The silence of the other evangelists is, therefore, no contradiction to Matthew; but because this silence is made an argument against the truth of Christianity, I shall examine it, as far as it relates to Mark and John. Both of them had read Matthew, they could not, therefore, omit the history of the keepers, because they knew nothing of it, but because they considered it false, or be-

cause it did not apply to their situation. The objections, raised to the history of the evangelists, namely, that it looked as if coming from people who had agreed in the main point, but had forgotten to arrange minor circumstances, do not apply here, for if the evangelists were deceivers, Mark and John had only to take their history from Matthew, and even if every thing had been invented, not to have omitted this part of the story, merely because it had been invented. At Rome, at Alexandria, at Ephesus, they might have related it much more securely, and much less exposed to contradiction, than Matthew, assuming even that it was false, could have done in the circle of Palestine. But why do they omit it? John evidently omits it, in conformity with his usual plan of writing, which is to omit in his own gospel what his readers have found in the other gospels, and therefore his silence, so far from being an objection, is equivalent to a confirmation of what existed, and what he assumes to be known from Matthew. Mark does it, because this objection to the resurrection was unknown at Rome, where he wrote, and required, therefore, no contradiction.

62. "*Now the next day that followed the day*

of the preparation."] Literally translated, on the following day, which is after Friday. As it is self-evident that one day must follow another, and it requires no author to tell us this, the meaning is, "on the following day, immediately after the end of Friday," or in other words, immediately after sunset, with which, according to the custom of the Jews, the day ends, and the sabbath begins. This mode of speaking seems singular in Greek, but in Hebrew, from the same word signifying "evening," "holy evening," or, as we should say, "vespers," it becomes more intelligible. The meaning is, that from an apprehension the body might be stolen in the night, they did not wait until the following morning, they went immediately to Pilate that same evening, which now no longer belonged to Friday, but formed part of the sabbath, and requested a guard. That it was already sabbath, forms no objection to their going to Pilate; bodily labour was not undertaken by the Jews on the sabbath, but it must have been permissible to ask a favour of the civil authority, especially when it was connected with the honour of their religion. This was neither contrary to the traditions of the elders, nor to the doctrines of the Pharisees. The

Jews had the privilege from the Romans not to be cited before legal tribunals, that is, before Roman tribunals on the sabbath, but Jewish judicial cases might be attended to on the sabbath, since they considered this, as studying the law, and the law was derived from Moses, and was, if not literally the word of God, the illustration of the word of God. A Jew will give an answer upon Jewish questions of legislation in the same way as our clergymen would give answers upon questions of conscience, and I have applied to Jews, who were very scrupulous about their sabbath, and they have given me answers upon questions of their own law. The Roman privilege did not prevent the Jews from soliciting assistance from the civil authorities upon sabbath days. This removes an objection which has been made to the application for a guard occurring on a sabbath.

62. "*The chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate.*"] These words are misunderstood, partly through too literal a translation, partly through a misconception of another kind. When we read "the chief priests and Pharisees," we conceive the whole synod of the Jews, and thus the objection, which has been raised against this passage, is supported. This is a clear misconception; the Pharisees were a sect

and there were many of them in the supreme council of the Jews, not as Pharisees, but under another title; "high priests and Pharisees" were, it is probable, a fair description of the whole, in the same way as we should say, speaking of an university, "heads of colleges, and those who entertained a particular opinion." When the evangelists wish to describe the Sanhedrim, according to the different members of which it was composed, they express themselves "the high priests," "the scribes or learned men," "the elders." It consisted, (1) of certain members of the sacerdotal order, who from their seat in council were called "high priests;" (2) of the heads of families of the tribes of Israel, and they were termed "elders;" (3) of the learned members, or as we should call them, of "the learned body." They might be equally Pharisees or Sadducees, for the last were so little excluded from the council, that the majority of the high priests were of this sect. We must not, therefore, think of the Sanhedrim collectively, but according to the words as they stand here, "high priests and Pharisees." The high priests were, as I have stated, chiefly, but Hannas and Caiphas certainly, of the sect of the Sadducees; to these must be added certain of the Pharisees, or of that learned body, who had a seat and a

voice in the great council. It is not, therefore, the whole synod who go to Pilate, and probably not even a deputation from it, but certain of the chief priests, with the rival sect of the Pharisees, go to Pilate in a state of anxiety, and beg for a guard. There has been great misconception of the words "came together unto Pilate." Some suppose the synod to have assembled as a body, which is a very natural supposition, and make the place of meeting to have been in Pilate's palace, which is again inconsistent for a deliberative body. Both the English and the German translations by the adoption of the word "together" favour this opinion, which, however, is not a just deduction from the Greek phrase, which literally signifies "they assembled themselves to Pilate." But to a real Greek scholar there ought to have been no difficulty. Taking the Greek in combination, with the Hebrew, as it probably stood in the original, it does not amount to more than "going to a person," and this is confirmed by the Syriac translation. Even supposing the original to have been Greek, still it is only a Hebraism, and of these there are many examples.

The objections that have been raised against this narrative are—

1. That it is incredible, the whole council should have moved in a body to Pilate the first day of Easter, and accompany the guard collectively to the grave. Such a procession must have created a very remarkable sensation.

So incredible that Matthew does not mention it, and the confusion arises from the enlarged view that is taken of the word "together." The text does not state the synod, it speaks of chief priests, (Sadducees,) and of Pharisees, who had made application for a guard. But supposing they were the great council, such a body generally does not act in a mass, but by deputing individuals.

2. Every thing might have been arranged by a deputation, and not by the procession of the whole synod.

This is another of those objections, which arise from the construction put upon the word "together."

63. The chief priests may here refer to the words of Christ, quoted by John ii. 19., which some amongst them may have understood; although a different sense was given to it, before the judgment seat, where the false witnesses declared that Jesus said he would destroy the temple of God, which was built by human

labour, Mark xiv. 58. Jesus, however, had said this before, although in different words, partly in public, and partly to his disciples, who did not, however, understand it, and conceived it to have a figurative meaning. Matt. xii. 39, 40. xvi. 1, 4., where the Pharisees and Sadducees, receive the same answer and again ch. xvii. 23. The objection that has been raised, that his disciples could not from these words have expected his resurrection, is trifling. The wily enemy, who attends to the minutiæ of expression, dissects and twists them in a manner, which the principles or prejudices of friendship cannot understand. The words of Jesus were sufficiently clear, and the disciples did not understand them, because they thought that Jesus would not die—because he was the Christ—and that Christ was not to die.

64. An objection has been started that the synod might of their own authority have placed a guard over the grave, and that it was consequently unnecessary to solicit the interference of Pilate. The answer is easy; certainly they might have done so; but a civic guard does not afford the security of a military, and especially at that time, of a Roman military guard.

"*Lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away.*"] Such a deceit had in fact, about seventeen years before, been played off by a servant of the name of Clemens, who stole the ashes and the bones of his murdered master, Agrippa, spread a report amongst the people that Agrippa had fortunately escaped, and was still alive, gave himself out for Agrippa, and aspired, under this name, to mount the imperial throne. Tacitus relates this history at large in his Annals, Book ii. ch. 39, 40. As an imposture of this kind, which had nearly shaken the Roman empire, and involved it in civil war, was still fresh in memory, the care and the entreaty of the Jews was very reasonable, and Pilate could not well refuse it, without exposing himself to serious responsibility.

65. "*A watch.*"] The Greek of Matthew has here the Latin word, which probably may have been in the original Hebrew, as the old Syriac translation retains it.

"*Ye have a watch.*"] That is, I grant you a watch, and give orders to that effect, to the officer commanding in Fort Antonia. This guard, according to Roman custom, consisted probably of sixteen soldiers, four of whom were constantly on sentry, and from time to time were relieved by the others. Some translate it

" you have already a watch," namely, the guard that attended at the crucifixion. But this guard could not have been continued over the grave, without further orders; and after the dead bodies were taken down, were probably withdrawn. The permission of Pilate was to guard the grave to the utmost of their power, and for this they had a sufficient force.

66. The seal, perhaps, according to the usages of the east, was impressed in clay :—this, however, is not important. The sealing would be probably binding a band or ligature round the wooden part of the door of the sepulchre, and the stone lying before it, whilst the ligature itself would be sealed upon the stone; or we may suppose a double door to the grave with two holes, and bound at either end—the ligature running through them, and then twisted round the great stone lying before it; it is obvious the impression may be so made, as to render it impossible for the stone to be taken away, without breaking the seal. It need only be twisted round the post of the door, to produce the same effect. With regard to the sealing of the sepulchre, (in doing which, the active party must have been unclean,) an inconsistent objection has been raised: " How could the chief

priest conduct himself so indecorously before the people, as actually to touch a grave?" Certainly a priest of that rank would not have sealed the grave with his own hands, for he was not permitted to make himself unclean with any dead body, except in the case of his nearest relative, (Leviticus xxi. 1, 4.) and he who touched a grave was unclean; but where is it mentioned that the high priest put his finger upon it? They were not only priests, who requested the seal, but Pharisees, probably members of the Sanhedrim, and they could become unclean without any sin, for to be levitically unclean was no sin. I do not, however, conceive a person of the high rank, as a member of the Sanhedrim, to have actually laid his hands upon it; some officer of justice may fairly be supposed to have pressed the seal, whatever it was, upon the tomb. Whether he became unclean, as the stone was outside of the grave, I know not; he who touched the grave himself, and drew the cord, which was to be sealed, through the door of the grave, became unclean, those who stood by, and ordered it, remained clean. Is this the objection of ignorance or ill-nature? A learned man, especially a theologian, would scarcely have made it.

"*And setting a watch.*"] There are three illustrations of this passage.

1. That the guard was not sufficient, and they therefore appointed an additional watch, fearful lest the soldiers should be bribed, and the dead body stolen away.

2. In the presence of the guard.

3. They went together with the guard, and sealed the grave.

None of these illustrations are to be rejected, but I prefer the first. Other objections have been made to the truth of this narrative, but there is one which does appear to me extraordinary. "The women go early on Sunday morning to the grave, without fearing any interruption from the soldiers, and in fact as if they knew nothing of any soldiers being there. The circumstance of a guard is, therefore, an inconsistent and obvious invention of Matthew." It is probable the women knew nothing of the soldiers; they were only applied for after sunset, when the sabbath had already commenced, and consequently could only have been posted at the sepulchre, after darkness had set in, and when the women had already returned to the city. Four sentries, or the relief of a small guard, placed in a garden outside of the

city, would have created little sensation in Jerusalem, which, at the time of Easter, may have, perhaps, contained a million of inhabitants. It is not to be wondered at, that the women, during the whole of the sabbath, should know nothing about it. In a small town or village, such a circumstance would be remarked, but whoever has lived in a large town, as in London, for instance, will easily understand the force of my observation.

IV. The women buy spices to embalm the body of Christ.

Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiii. 56.

Mark xvi. 1. "*And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.*"

"*And when the Sabbath was past.*"] As long as the Sabbath lasts Jews dare not sell or buy; they waited therefore, of necessity for its termination, before they bought the spices, that is, according to the custom of the Jews, until

the stars in heaven were visible on Saturday evening. A rich Jew may obtain what he wants on the Sabbath day, but it must be in the shape of a gift, which he bargains and pays for the succeeding day; he must be known, however, to be a rich man, which could have hardly been the case with these women. A translation has been proposed of "a Sabbath intervening between the two days," in order to obviate a supposed inconsistency with Luke xxiii. 56, but which, as we shall see afterwards, is really of no importance whatever. This latter translation is clearly contrary to the customs of the Jews, who did not dare to buy on the Sabbath day, and it is inconceivable, why the women should have wished to buy on the Sabbath day, when in the evening after sunset, namely, from the first appearance of the stars, from half past six, or three quarters before seven, they had sufficient time to buy what spices they liked.

Salome, as we may perceive by comparing Mark xv. 40, with Matthew xxvii. 56, is the mother of Zebedee's children, that is, the mother of John and of the elder James. We must here guard against an error, which has deceived many readers. The generality of the

readers of Mark, not reflecting who Salome is, conceive her, of course, to be of the number of those who came early in the morning to the grave of Christ, and are surprised at not finding her name in Matthew xxviii. 1. But this silence would be no proof, that she was not with those, who came to the grave, because, as I shall show hereafter, more came to the grave, than Matthew names; but the omission of her name in another part of the history, makes it tolerably certain, that she was not of the number of those, who went to the grave of Jesus. Salome was the mother of John, and if she had been at the grave, he would, according to his manner, relate something that she either said or did, as an appendix to the other evangelists, but this he does not; he does not even mention her name. It appears to me that she had bought with her money, spices for embalming, but that she did not go to the grave; and when we consider her situation, this is easily conceivable; indeed, it would have been singular, if she had done so. Her son, John, had taken Mary, the mother of Jesus, into his house, (John xix. 27,) and is it probable, that Salome should leave the mother of Jesus alone, on the morning, when it was intended to em-

balm the dead body? Her son ran to the grave (John xx. 3,) in consequence of the information he received of the body being missing, but his mother would naturally remain with the mother of Jesus, especially where the grief was so recent, and still more so, if in a state of uncertainty and alarm; neither she therefore, or Mary, the mother of Jesus, were amongst those, who went down to the grave, nor have we any record, that Jesus showed himself to his mother after his resurrection, except she was of the number of those, to whom it was told that they might see him in Galilee. If John does not mention the purchase of the ointment, to which his mother contributed, it is no contradiction; he omits it, as being already known through another evangelist. According to his custom in narration, silence is confirmation, but if any incorrect circumstance is related by Mark, we should find in John a gentle, but very accurate explanation. But now comes the objection, which has been urged with such force by the enemies of Christianity, "Why should these women buy spices, when Jesus, according to John, was already wrapped up in myrrh and aloes by Joseph and Nicodemus?" With respect

to the fact itself, we have no further historical illustration, but there is more than one probable solution of the difficulty.

1. They, perhaps, knew nothing of what had previously occurred. They saw the spot, where he was laid, but no one of the evangelists says, that they were present, when he was embalmed. The burial was very quick, as it naturally would be, to have it over before sunset; (Jewish burials are always hasty.) It does not seem to have been the design of Joseph to wrap Jesus in myrrh and aloes, and the arrival of Nicodemus with the spices appears to have been unexpected; it may be even supposed that this embalming with spices did not take place, in the open air, but in the sepulchre, into which it became a question of scrupulousness to introduce the dead body, as soon as possible. If this were so, the women, who went home after having remarked the place, where he was laid, and could not, perhaps, see what was passing in a narrow tomb, would know nothing of it.

2. But if they did know it, they might have the intention of honouring him still more, as the envelopment and burial, must, in consequence of the approaching Sabbath, have

taken place very hastily. If there is any truth in what the Rabbis have stated in the Thalmud, of covering the body with spices, and I will not deny the existence of it, in the time of Christ, although it has been improperly applied to explain some passages in the Old Testament, where the question relates to the burning of dead bodies, they might have covered the corpse with spices, without wrapping him up a second time.

3. But, in fact, although Jesus was so hastily embalmed, according to Jewish customs, (John xix. 40,) might they mean to embalm him according to the Egyptian custom, and fill the body with spices? I believe not, but it would not have been contrary to law, for Jacob was embalmed in this manner, (Gen. v. 2.) and it was never subsequently prohibited.

From our deficiency of materials, it is impossible for me to decide upon probabilities, but the first seems the most probable.

The enemies of Christianity have even asserted, that Joseph and Nicodemus embalmed the body on Friday evening, in the presence and with the assistance of the women. But not a word of this is in the evangelists, and,

therefore, this is only a contest between the accuracy of the gospels, and the imagination of an unbeliever.

LUKE XXIII. 56.

56. "*And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandments.*"

The words, literally translated, upon which so much has been said, as contradictory of Mark, would run thus, "After that they had returned, they prepared spices and ointments, and on the Sabbath day they were quiet." For my own part, I do not see a shadow of contradiction, but I will endeavour to explain the words. "They return to the city." This took place, when the Friday ceased, and the Sabbath began about sunset, or perhaps later; "they buy spices," which, according to the Jewish customs, they could not buy on the Sabbath, for on the Sabbath they are quiet. But they buy them immediately after the Sabbath. We should say, "They return to Jerusalem in the evening, and, as the Sabbath had begun, when no sale and purchase

is allowed, they remain inactive during the Sabbath; they buy nothing, because nothing is to be bought. As soon as the Sabbath is over, namely on Saturday evening, when the stars are visible in heaven, they buy spices." Is there any contradiction in this to Mark? and yet this is the assertion of those, to whom great talents and great learning have been ascribed. Because the words, "rested on the Sabbath," conclude the sentence, it has been assumed, that the Sabbath followed the purchase of the spices; but it was not considered, that the women could not have been in the city before the commencement of the Sabbath, which begins at sunset, and that they could not have purchased the spices upon entering the city, because sales and purchases cease amongst the Jews on Friday afternoon about three o'clock. If they did purchase and rested upon the Sabbath, it must have been, as Mark says, after the Sabbath was over. Some of our commentators have erred considerably in consequence of their ignorance, that the Jewish days are calculated from sunset; and they then proceed to infer, that Mark and Luke contradicted each other, that the translation of Mark is erroneous, and that the women must have

made two distinct purchases, the one before, and the other after the Sabbath. They were not aware, that, if they entered the city after sunset on Friday evening, it was not possible to make purchases, before the commencement of the Sabbath; and yet this has given rise to the following objection. "Luke says, that the women bought the spices and the ointment on Friday evening after sunset, and rested the Sabbath;" but Mark states, that they did not buy the spices, "until the Sabbath was past." But this is impossible; for they did not return from the grave, until after sunset; and then the objection is heightened by this addition, "that the antients were aware of this contradiction, and preferred omitting the history of the resurrection by Mark." Precisely the reverse! for the ninth to the sixteenth verses of the sixteenth chapter of Mark are omitted by many manuscripts, but in these there is no immediate reference to the subject, whilst the preceding eight verses, in which the contradiction is supposed to exist, are uniformly admitted to be genuine. But these objections can never be considered as flowing from the pen of a really learned man. He must be deeply imbued with, I may say, hatred

to the Christian religion, who could make these objections, and, at the same time, claim the character of deep learning. This miserable cavil rests upon the mode in which the words follow in Luke, because he says, first, " they brought spices and ointments," and then adds, " but this was not done on the Sabbath, because it would have been contrary to law."

V. The resurrection of jesus, together with the first intelligence, which the women brought of it.

Matt. xxviii. 1—11. Mark xvi. 2—8. Luke xxiv. 1—11. John xx. 1—9.

Matt. xxviii. 1—11.

1. " *In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.*

2. " *And, behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.*

3. " *His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow.*

4. *" And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.*

5. *" And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified.*

6. *" He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay.*

7. *" And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him; lo! I have told you.*

8. *" And they departed quickly from the sepulchre, with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word.*

9. *" And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.*

10. *" Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me."*

1. *" In the end of the sabbath."*] These are singularly obscure words, probably the effect of the Greek translation of Matthew, and which I would rather that my reader should pass over, if he should find my dissertation tedious. Literally it would be on the evening of the sabbath, (ὀψὲ,) that is, on the evening, which fol-

lowed the sabbath; but the whole connection shows it to refer to the morning, which followed the sabbath, (or as we should say, early in the morning between four and six,) and this is distinctly stated by the other evangelists, Mark xvi. 1, 2. Luke xxiv. 1. John xx. 1. Some have thought it might be translated, "the night after the sabbath." But this is not a translation, which can be supported by any authority. Others say it should be translated, "late in the sabbath." But it sounds oddly both in English and in German, that what takes place early on Monday morning, (about four or five o'clock,) should be late on the Sunday, and with the Jews, who reckoned always from sun-set, it is perfectly inadmissible. Kypke says, "the succeeding night is sometimes reckoned by the Hebrews to the preceding day, as Exodus xii. 42." The idea is right, and I could mention other examples; but it only occurs when the case relates to an evening meal, or to a fast, for the evening meal is naturally annexed to the preceding day. On the sabbath it is totally distinct, for its entire sanctity ceases, according to the custom of the Jews, when the stars are visible in heaven. Heuman, who is anxious to elucidate, makes the case still worse. He con-

siders the word "sabbath," as equivalent to "week," and translates it, "late in the week," that is, "at the end of the week." "Late" it may be, but not in the week, and he brings no example to confirm it; and unfortunately it takes place in the commencement of the week. To which it is answered, the beginning of the week follows the end, and therefore it is late in the week; but this is not illustration. For myself, I must think the Greek translator has made some mistake, and so thought Jerome before me, only he has not pointed out the exact difficulty. Jerome was acquainted with the Hebrew original, and if he had had it by him, when he wrote this conjecture, we should have been relieved from every doubt. My idea is, that in the original Hebrew the word was "twilight," and in fact where the Hebrew word, Isaiah v. 19. has this signification, the septuagint have rendered it by "late," the very Greek word that is adopted by the Greek translator of Matthew. Taking it therefore as the morning twilight, which sense it has already borne, then Matthew coincides with the other evangelists, and the text would run thus; "in the twilight, after the sabbath, with which the first day in the week, namely, the Sunday,

commences." Probable as this explanation may be, I still have my doubts upon it, for I find in four Greek manuscripts, a variation, which very much alters the sense, and which not having much attracted the notice of the learned, has been, perhaps, too little investigated. These four manuscripts, of which two, (the 8th of Stephanus, and the 2d of Usher,) are particularly valuable on account of their various readings, omit the Greek particle, which answers to our "and" and "but." In this case the words would belong to the preceding chapter, and would run thus:—"They secured the grave with a guard, and sealed the stone on the sabbath evening," that is, "on the evening, when the sabbath had already commenced,"—and this, according to Matthew xxvii. 62., did take place. This would make it perfectly easy and consistent, but a various reading must then be added, which would begin the 28th chapter thus: "And as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week;" at the same time I do not find such a various reading in any manuscript. But have the manuscripts been sufficiently examined? The question deserves investigation, and if I could find any manuscript, which would bear the latter construction, I

should prefer it, and place the words "in the end of the sabbath," at the close of the 27th chapter.

"*The first day of the week.*"] Sunday. The usual method of expression in Syriac. Sabbath with Jews, Chaldæans, and Syrians, is not merely sabbath, but "week," and in saying "one day of the sabbath, or of the first month," we mean "the first day of the first month." This occurs Genesis xl. 2.

"*The other Mary.*"] See Matthew xxvii. 61. and the comment.

(2—4.) What is here related evidently took place previous to the arrival of the women at the grave, for they do not see the stone rolled back, but only that it lies no longer before the grave; they do not see, even according to Matthew, any keepers. The angel, when they come, sits no longer upon the stone, but is, as I shall show in the fifth verse, in the sepulchre. As no one, however, saw this, except the Roman soldiers, who guarded the sepulchre, and who had received money, that they might be silent about what they saw, and with a view to circulate a falsehood, how could Matthew, it may be asked, be acquainted with it? In my opinion, the answer is easy, not from immediate and di-

vine inspiration, but from the loquacity of the soldiers. They must, at the least, have been four in number at the sepulchre, when the events occurred. A secret, known to four persons, could not long remain so under the influence of money, at least for any lapse of time. He who is paid, states for his money, what he is required to state, but, when his spirits are elevated, and he is with his friends, when the wonderful narration becomes the subject of ridicule or inquiry, when he is asked whether they all slept so sound, as to be insensible to sight or hearing, when by the notoriety, which the Christian religion was gradually acquiring, much of Jesus and of his rumoured resurrection was circulated, he then says to others in confidence, what he actually saw, these repeat it in confidence, and thus in the course of eight years, (for sooner after the resurrection of Christ, Matthew did not write,) Christians, as well as biographers of Jesus, in Palestine, may have learnt the fact.

2. "*And behold, there was a great earthquake.*"] Thus it has been translated in the English, and in Luther's translation, and it is in this sense used and understood by the majority of commentators. But in this there may

be some error: an earthquake is very extensive, and it would be an extraordinary statement, if we were to say, "there was a great earthquake, for an angel rolled back the stone from the sepulchre. But if we translate it as a convulsive motion of the earth, we should not give it the extensive and popular term of earthquake. I would rather state it thus:—"The ground about the grave was completely shaken, and that something fell, which could only be compared to lightning, and had the effect of driving away the stone from the door, to such a distance, as to create this violent concussion." This may be the sense, but I have my doubts. The same Greek word, which we translate "earthquake," is applied to the keepers in the fourth verse, and yet in that exact sense, no man would apply it to them. My own opinion is, "that something very terrible occurred, for an angel of the Lord," &c., and we should always remember, that we have here only a translation from the Hebrew, which is expressed in the Syriac translation by what means great terror and trembling, as well as a great earthquake.

"*For the angel of the Lord.*"] If, in this place, there appears a contradiction of the other evangelists, who mention two angels, this will

not apply to our present discussion, nor should we unnecessarily meet difficulties. The question here is, not what the women saw, when they came to the tomb, after it was deserted by the keepers, but what the keepers themselves saw.

3. "*His countenance was like lightning.*"] The Greek word translated here as countenance, occurs Genesis v. 3, and Daniel i. 23, as bodily form. This could not, however, apply here, for an assumed form in a white garment, would not act upon the sight, like lightning. But the 2 Maccabees iii. 16, justifies the translation of the word "countenance." Beza conceived it to signify that brilliancy of eye, which shone like lightning. This is the more probable, and it has often struck me, that something like this might be the meaning. "The keepers, at first saw what appeared to be lightning, descend from heaven, and the stone was rolled back: when they recovered from their first terror, they saw a human form in a white garment, sitting upon the stone." Of course I do not presume to give this opinion, as founded upon certainty.

4. It appears that the keepers fell, through terror, upon the ground, and lay, as if dead,

upon the earth: when they came to themselves, they ran away; consequently the women, who, according to Matthew, come to the sepulchre, see no keepers, and in John xx. neither Mary Magdalene, Peter, or John himself, meet with any keepers, either in the garden, or at the tomb.

5. "*And the angel answered, and said.*"] This is the translation, but as the women had asked no questions, it should be "the angel addressing them, spake unto the women." The Greek, both in the Septuagint, and in the New Testament, will bear this signification. We must observe here, that the angel does not sit, where the keepers saw him, upon the stone, but in the tomb. Matthew does not expressly say this; but it may be inferred from the 6th and 8th verses; for he says "He is not here; come, see the place, where the Lord lay." He must have been consequently in the tomb, and when the angel had ceased speaking, "they departed quickly from the sepulchre." The other evangelists state it more clearly, so that there is no contradiction, but less detail.

6. "*The Lord.*"] Even those commentators, who do not believe in the eternal Divinity of Christ, (and I wish to include them in this re-

mark,) consider it as worthy of much regard, that an angel should have given Jesus this surpassing distinction. There are, indeed, a few manuscripts who omit the word "Lord," but they are too few to justify a reading distinct from the established version.

7. "*Tell his disciples.*"] I see no reason why this information should be confined to the eleven apostles, as all who believed and heard him, were his disciples: or why it should not embrace those who considered him as the Messiah, as for instance, Joseph of Arimathea, who, we are told (xxvii. 57.), was his disciple. This observation seems scarcely necessary, but as arguments have been raised upon it, in order to show an apparent contradiction, between Matthew xxviii. 9, 11, and Mark xvi. 7, founded upon this limited construction of the word, I shall remark upon it when I come to this last evangelist.

"*Lo! I have told you.*"] This certainly seems unnecessary, especially when Jesus, (Matthew xxvi. 32, and Mark xiv. 28.) had already told them. Learned men have suggested it should be, "Lo! he has told you," in consequence of the same reading in Mark. The two Greek vowels, which constitute the difference,

are very similar, particularly when a little faded. The error, if error it is, probably occurred at the time of the Greek being written in large letters, and if no old manuscripts, nor old translation, have the reading, "he has told you," I should be disposed to think it a clerical error of the first century, and as such carried into the compilation of the gospels. I profess so little doubt upon it, as to have adopted it in my translation.

9. "*Saying, all hail.*"] Probably the original Hebrew would convey the words, "Peace be with you;" but the translator took the salutation, in general use.

"*Held him by the feet.*"] Those who were desirous to obtain favours, or to evince high respect, did this formerly, but to us, who live in the northern parts of Europe, it seems strange and inconsistent. We find it exemplified, 2 Kings iv. 27., and more amply discussed by Pliny, (Nat. His. Book II. Sec. 103.) "The "human knee has always, according to tradition, "enjoyed a certain sanctity. He who solicits "with humility, lays hold of it, extends his hands, "kisses it with adoration, or embraces it as an "altar." The conduct of the women is, at once, indicative of terror and admiration. They see a being raised from the dead, and whom they na-

turally conclude to be of a superior and heavenly order, and according to the manners of the Jews, and of the east, pray with trembling. (See Luke v. 8. Judges vi. 23. xiii. 22. 1 Kings xvii. 18.) Jesus says, therefore, to them, "Be not afraid."

10. "*My brethren.*"] The same as "disciples," only kinder. That they were brethren of Jesus because "God is his Father and their Father" we shall find confirmed by Christ himself. (John xx. 17.)

APPENDIX TO THE HEBREW GOSPEL.

The Hebrew gospel of Matthew, not the genuine, but the interpolated gospel of the Nazarenes, had either here, or after verse 15, an addition, which, in treating of the history of the resurrection, I cannot pass over. Jerome has preserved a part of it in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers. He says, in speaking of the younger James, "The gospel, according to the Hebrews, which I have lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which is often quoted by Origen, relates, after the resurrection of our Saviour, as follows:—

"But the Lord (after he had given his bu-

rial clothes to the servant of the high priest) went to James and appeared to him; for James, from the hour that he had drank the cup of the Lord, had sworn not to eat, until he had seen him again risen from amongst those who slept." (B. 4, sec. 103, Benedictine Edition.) The words between the brackets in the above quotation are wanting in some copies. From this it was to be inferred Jesus had met the servant of the high priest, and given him his sepulchral garments, that he might acquaint him with the fact of his resurrection; then follows, "and the Lord said, bring a table and bread," and immediately afterwards, "He took the bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to James the Just, and said unto him, My brother, eat thy bread, since the Son of man is again risen from amongst those who sleep." James bore the title of Just, and his piety was highly respected by the Jews. He was a near relation, or as the Bible terms it, a brother of Jesus. There is some latent truth in this narration, for Paul (1 Corinthians xv. 7,) speaks of a particular notice or appearance, which James was favoured with, after the resurrection of Jesus;

this appendix is not, however, from the hand of Matthew; it is more probable to have been a subsequent addition of the Nazarenes or Ebionites, who disfigured authenticated facts with frivolous circumstances, wrote them, at first, upon the margin of the Hebrew, and finally, in their deficiency of critical knowledge, introduced them into the recognised text. Without referring to those parts of this narration, which have been already noticed as improbable or incorrect, they do not stand in the right place. It is said, that Jesus showed himself on the first day of the resurrection, earlier to James than to the other apostles; but how does this coincide with Luke xxiv. 34? Should not the apostles have said, "The Lord has appeared to James and to Simon." Paul places this appearance, with the addition of the word "after that," subsequent to the appearance in Galilæa, when Jesus showed himself to more than five hundred brethren; and it seems probable, that James obtained the appellation of "the Just," an epithet, which is never given him in the New Testament, some time after Matthew had written his gospel, and perhaps, not long before his martyrdom, which, according to Josephus, was a subject of such

mortification to the Jews. (Antiq. b. 20, sect. 9, 1.) This appendix seems to throw no light on the history of the resurrection.

MARK XVI. 2—8.

2. "*And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.*

3. "*And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone at the door of the sepulchre?*

4. "*And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away; for it was very great.*

5. "*And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man, sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted.*

6. "*And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted; ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified; he is risen; he is not here, behold the place, where they laid him.*

7. "*But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.*

8. "*And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled, and were amazed; neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.*"

2. "*Very early.*"] I conceive no one, who reads this in the translation, will suppose all this to have taken place between five and six, especially in a warm climate, where it would not be considered early. The Greek λίαν πρωΐ is, however, sufficiently explanatory. It signifies the time of night from the first obscure dawn to the rising of the sun, and even the last night watch from three to six; and as the word "very" is added, it must have been the beginning of dawn. Luke and John express this still stronger, for when the women went out, it was still dark, although, after the equinox in April, the light increases with great rapidity. I should say, therefore, the translation "at the rising of the sun," is saying too much; it should rather be, "as the sun was about to rise," or better "as the day began to break."

7. "*His Disciples and Peter.*"] This last word "and Peter," has been generally misunderstood by commentators; they have not felt, although Peter must have felt, what humiliation is conveyed in these words. He had three times denied his master, and had separated himself from the number of his disciples, he may well, therefore, have doubted, whether

the news of the resurrection of Jesus, and the command to go into Galilee was intended for him also, who, from his timidity, was no longer a disciple. The words, therefore, "and Peter," are kind and consolatory. Jesus recognises him still as a disciple, but accompanies the notice with an humiliating distinction, as if a doubt was already in existence, whether he belonged to the disciples of Jesus. Instead of this, it has been generally supposed that the addition of Peter's name argued a degree of honourable precedence above the others. I think, a man, who was in similar circumstances, would explain the words according to his own sensibility to the reproof, and the consciousness of his own conduct would do the rest. Passages have been adduced, where the conjunction "and" favours the common interpretation; but the addition here must have a secret influence on the mind and memory of a man, who had separated himself from Jesus; at all events, the passages, which Palaiset produces, are not conclusive; he appeals to Acts i. 14, where the eleven are met for prayer, "with the women and Mary," and this he thinks conveys the precise meaning of "with the women, and especially with

Mary;" but translate it "with her women," and the distinction falls to the ground. For this purpose he quotes a passage of Herodian, book 2, chap. 6, which says, "When the news of the death of Commodus resounded in the city, the people were overjoyed; every one announced the agreeable intelligence to his friends, but particularly to those who stood in high offices, and to the rich; for they knew that Commodus *also* had designs against their life." This word "also" he has changed to "principally," as if his object was to attack the lives of the poor, who had no treasures, and not to confine himself to the rich, whose property he was desirous to acquire.

"*That he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you,*"] namely, Matthew xxvi. 32, and Mark xiv. 28. We must here answer an objection, which has been made to this passage, and again to Matthew xxviii. 9, 11. Why was it necessary to send the apostles to Galilee, when Jesus was to show himself to them on the evening of the same day at Jerusalem. I conceive this is easily answered, if I have not done it already. The apostles were not alone his disciples, but all those who believed in Jesus—of

these, as many as were inclined to put their faith to this test, were to see him in Galilee at a fixed place, and at an appointed time, and accordingly we find from 1 Corinth. xv. 16, that he was so seen of more than five hundred brethren at once. This was the situation, where every believer could prove with his own eyes, the truth of the resurrection, and for which his mind was prepared by previous thought and information. It is therefore, no diminution of this truth, that Jesus did more than he had promised, and that he showed himself to his apostles, who did not expect it, on the first and eighth day at Jerusalem. But did they, independent of this, go to Galilee afterwards? I should certainly say, yes! for it would have been the height of indifference, not to have done so. I am surprised, that this frivolous objection should have placed the friends of Christianity in any embarrassment, or that it should have led to explanations so forced, that the enemies of Christianity must have been delighted with them. Thus they say, that in Matthew xxviii. 6, 7, and in Mark xvi. 7, the persons, to whom the injunction applies are only those mentioned in the text; in fact, that the women are not to convey the

news to the disciples, but are themselves to go to Galilee, and there to see Jesus, and for this purpose they assume the existence of a Greek particle, which, in this case, would only be an expletive, in order to accommodate the illustration to the text of Mark, and even make the angel almost swear to the truth of his own mission. According to this explanation, the angel speaks thus to the women, "Tell his disciples and Peter, I swear unto you, he goeth into Galilee, and there shall ye (women) see him, as he said unto you." We do not know where he told the women; but our commentators upon the resurrection, speak confidently that he told them in Galilee. In my opinion, the adversaries of Christianity would consider it next to a triumph to hear such a forced explanation; but they must rejoice much more where it becomes more inconclusive than the usual one; for the women were the first, who saw Jesus, even before the apostles, at the sepulchre; why then should they be required to go to Galilee to see him there? Those who are inclined to be sceptical, consider "my brethren" (Matthew xxviii. 10,) to relate to the personal relatives of Christ, and that they were to see him first in Galilee; this explana-

tion is not so bad as the first, but it is inconsistent with John xx. 17, and at the same time unnecessary. We have only to extend the commandment, not merely to the twelve apostles, but to all, who believe in Christ, and there is no longer any difficulty.

8. "*Neither said they any thing to any man, for they were afraid.*"] If the eight following verses of Mark are genuine, and from the hand of Mark, I know not how to extract any other sense from the verses 8—11, than the following, but which I am at a loss to reconcile with the narrations of the other evangelists. The other women only saw the angels, but not Jesus personally. The angels commanded them to convey the intelligence of his resurrection to his disciples, but they were afraid to do it, and mentioned it to no one. Mary Magdalene saw Jesus himself, and she carried the information of his resurrection to his disciples. But this is an evident contradiction of Matthew and of Luke, according to the two last, the other women see Jesus as they go away from the grave, and as has been hostilely observed, on their return to Jerusalem, and at some distance from the grave, whilst Mary Magdalene, on the contrary, sees him close to the sepulchre; nor does it promote

our object to say that Matthew and Mark relate in the plural number, what properly is confined to Mary Magdalene. If, however, we attempt to obviate the difficulty, by saying, Mark does not deny the fact of Jesus showing himself to the other women, but that he appeared, in the first instance, to Mary Magdalene, although this explanation is scarcely reconcilable with the words of Mark, still another difficulty arises, for the other women had already left the grave, and returned to the city, when Mary Magdalene comes a second time, with Peter and John, to the sepulchre, and then Jesus appears to her. (John xx. 2—18.) If he appeared to the other women, as they returned to Jerusalem, they must have seen him sooner than Mary Magdalene, and, as we may conclude from Matthew and from Mark, carried the intelligence to Jerusalem. I have candidly stated my difficulties to my readers, as I feel them; and if the last eight verses of this 16th chapter are genuine, I am not in a situation to reconcile them. But these difficulties are not, however, of any great magnitude; we have only to follow the example of the ancient writers, who, more than 1400 years ago, rejected them, because they were found in such few Greek manuscripts, and the

difficulties vanish. In this case there is no longer any contradiction between Mark and any other evangelist, but between an unknown writer, (whose object has been to complete the gospel of Mark,) and Matthew and Luke. Before I come to the 9th, 10th, and 11th verses of this chapter, I shall state the arguments for and against their authenticity. But if we reject these verses of Mark, as I am much inclined to do, the case is quite altered; the eighth verse does not convey a meaning at variance with the other evangelists, but it becomes to a certain degree more unintelligible. It is impossible that he should have meant the women never said any thing of what they saw, to any man; for how could Mark know what they related, if they preserved an eternal silence? It is evident, he wishes to describe the history of the resurrection of Jesus; and how strangely would it terminate, if no one had ever seen him alive, but that even the women, who find the grave empty, and who see the angels, do not mention it to any one? The case, therefore, may stand in this way; Mark had written thus far, and designed to write more, perhaps to add what is contained in the other evangelists, perhaps to state that Jesus had himself appeared to the

women, and that they had returned to the city to convey his commands to his disciples or whatever it might be, but some circumstance, unknown to us, hindered him and he left his gospel unfinished, but ending with these words "for they were afraid," words which seem certainly to be inconsistent with the termination of a book. But even with this explanation, an unpleasant doubt remains, "neither said they any thing to any man, for they were afraid." To whom did they not say any thing? Did they say nothing in the city to the disciples of Jesus of that which they had seen? But after such a sight, and under such fear and trembling, it was impossible they could be silent! and, according to the other evangelists, they see Jesus, even before they return into the city, receive from him new instructions, and carry those instructions to his disciples. It is probable that it was the intention of Mark to continue the narrative, but, in this case, he could not have said "neither said they any thing to any man" for before Jesus appeared, there was no one present, to whom they could have said any thing. Mark is not only at variance with the other evangelists, but with himself, for the cause, namely, "being afraid, (and which is in evident connection with the fear of

the vision they had seen) does not reconcile itself with the circumstance of their not saying any thing to any man, what they knew of the resurrection of Jesus. Every difficulty would be obviated, if the words "to no man," were not there; if Mark had written "neither said they any thing," the sense would be, that upon their coming out of the sepulchre, they fled in great haste, that fear and trembling had taken possession of them, they said not a word, for they were afraid; that is, that from fear, they gave the angels no answer, but ran away as quickly as they could. I must confess that no old manuscript, and that no old translation omits the words "to no man," but which words do not appear to be adapted to the passage. If they are not the genuine reading, it must be an error in the copy of Mark, which the compiler of the books of the New Testament had and carried into his collection.

Some of the manuscripts, which have not the last eight verses, add full above 1200 years ago the following verses to the end of this gospel, which I do not wish to leave entirely unexplained. No single manuscript, which has come down to us, has the verses in the text, but many of them, (and they are to be found in

Wetstein) have a note or comment, which states that they have been met with in some older manuscripts, and this is confirmed by the marginal observations of the Syriac translation. From hence it is evident that the manuscripts which contained this addition were as old, if not older than the sixth century; they are, therefore, older than any Greek manuscript which have come down to our time. The following are the verses:

"Every thing which was commanded them, "with respect to Peter, they quickly executed; "after that Jesus had himself sent by them, the "holy and uncorrupt preaching of eternal salva-"tion from the east even unto the west."

I wish to explain these verses in order to shew that they are not from the hands of Mark, as they contain a mode of speaking, which was unusual with him, and a thought, which was scarcely to be expected from him.

"*Every thing which was commanded them.*"] According to this the women were not silent about what was intrusted to them, and the eighth verse only intimates that they spoke to no intermediate person. This would make the eighth verse much clearer.

"*With respect to Peter.*"] The original Greek is classical; (John xi. 19, Acts xiii. 13,

xxi. 8.) but for Mark, perhaps too good. A similar mode of construction does not occur in any part of his gospel, and he, of all the evangelists, writes the worst Greek.

"*Quickly.*"] This word does not bear the same acceptation as in Acts xxiv. 4, for how would it be possible to abridge the short injunction of the angel, without leaving out something essential? although the same as in the Proverbs, where it is said, "he shall quickly perish," it is a rare word to find in Mark who uses what we translate "straightways," forty times, and in the eighth verse "quickly," although from a different Greek. Besides the notes of the Syriac translation have it not.

"*From the east unto the west.*"] This is true, but would Mark have said it? Would he then know how far the gospel would extend? But to this it may be answered, he was with Peter in Babylon. 1 Peter v. 13.

"*Through them.*"] Namely, through the disciples mentioned in the seventh verse.

"*Incorrupt preaching.*"] That is, the pure gospel. We find this expression in the Book of Wisdom xviii. 4, but this, as well as the epithet "holy" does not strike me, as being in the usual style of Mark.

"*Eternal salvation.*"] I should have expected from Mark "his resurrection," but the whole of this appendix seems to betray a style different from Mark's.

LUKE XXIV. 1—11.

1. "*Now upon the first day, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.*

2. "*And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.*

3. "*And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.*

4. "*And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments;*

5. "*And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, why seek ye the living amongst the dead?*

6. *He is not here, but is risen: Remember how he spake unto you, when he was yet in Galilee,*

7. "*Saying, the son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.*

8. "*And they remembered his words.*

9. "*And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest.*

10. *" It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women, that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles.*

11. *And their words seemed to them, as idle tales, and they believed them not."*

1. Luke speaks evidently of more women than Matthew, and than Mark, as we may collect from the chap. xxiii. 55, and from the ninth verse of this quoted chapter; they were partly females, who accompanied Jesus from Galilee, and are mentioned Luke viii. 2, 3, partly also others who were with them, as we read in the tenth verse, and who, by their being distinguished from the former, may have probably resided at Jerusalem. We cannot assume that they went in a body to the sepulchre, and still less that, when they found it empty, they remained all equally long there. Mary Magdalene, according to John xx. 2, returned immediately to the city, when she found the grave empty. The probability is, that, as they did not all dwell together, they went separately by different routes to the sepulchre, and some returned earlier, some remained later. If Luke relates something more than the other evange-

lists, this is no contradiction; they do not, perhaps, speak of one and the same woman; Matthew and Mark name Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James, and yet they do not distinguish accurately what other women saw, and what Mary Magdelene alone saw; (John does,) and Luke may therefore have related, what upon authentic grounds he may have heard from other women, who visited the sepulchre.

"*Very early in the morning.*"] All the time from the first weak beginning of twilight until the actual rising of the sun is known in Greek by the word πρωϊ used by Mark xvi. 2. This again, is divided into two parts, of which the one, according to the Greek word (ὄρθρος) used by Luke, signifies the time of twilight, whilst it is yet dark and whilst it is still necessary to burn a light, and the other (ἕω) is expressed by a Greek word, which denotes the time, just before sunrise, and when the morning red appears. Wetstein, to whom I refer, has collected the parallel passages. Luke, therefore, speaks of the first beginning of twilight, when it was yet very dark.

"*Bringing the spices which they had prepared.*"] The objection, that Jesus was already

embalmed, I have answered. It is not stated here, they were desirous to embalm him; we have only to read the words of Luke and to suppose they wished to lay these spices upon the body of Jesus, wrapped up in his sepulchral clothes, or according to the custom of the Jews, upon the open bier, or place where the dead body was deposited. If Matthew says, they came only to see the grave, it is no contradiction; he says little, omits some things, and Mark, who otherwise generally follows him, says more.

3, 4. These verses seem to contain a contradiction, not so much with Matthew, for this, perhaps, might be obviated, but with Mark. The least is, that Mark has only one angel, and Luke has two. To this, however, an answer has been given, that only one angel spoke, and that it is of him that Mark writes, without denying the presence of two angels. But this answer does not please me. The most important objection is, that in Mark, the women, immediately upon their entering the grave see an angel; in Luke they go into the grave, find it empty, are astonished to find it so, and whilst their minds are thus occupied they perceive at once two angels standing before them, of whose presence they were previously unconscious. The ad-

versaries of Christianity have not failed to place this objection in a very forcible point of view, and which is not to be wondered at, considering how little credit is due to even the best existing explanation. But supposing this objection can in no wise be obviated, a Christian need feel no great inconvenience from it. For this is merely a contradiction between Luke and another evangelist, which is of much less consequence than between Matthew and John. In the first place, Luke is, as he himself states, no eyewitness of the whole history, but writes what he has collected with great industry from the authority of others. If a higher power, to which, however, he never appeals, does not make him infallible, he will occasionally be deficient, understand some things and arrange others erroneously, but it does not follow from this, as Lessing has ingeniously remarked, that the history of Jesus is unfounded or doubtful. I might say it was almost impossible for any man, looking upon him as a mere man, to write a long history, compiled, not from records or writings, but from the verbal narrations and traditions of others, without the intervention of some faults; and if this is to make a history suspicious, there is not one throughout the world which we can

regard, in the main points even, as authentic; not even the defeat of the Swedes at Pultowa, in 1709, for Voltaire, independent of many more important circumstances, has incorrectly described the colour of the coat which Charles XII. wore on that day. Luke may have heard two kinds of history, and mixed up the one with the other: the women, in Matthew, see only one angel; Mary Magdalene, according to John, sees the sepulchre open, and then two angels in it; supposing Luke to have heard the last statement, and in a manner which left no doubt upon his mind of its being perfectly authentic, but that he refers to that, which the greater number of women saw, the mistake is made, but without rendering the main fact of the history equivocal. But what then becomes of the divine inspiration of the evangelists? However little it may affect the other evangelists, we have certainly not the same reasons to give credit to it in Luke, who was himself no apostle, although Matthew and John were. Nor does his authority, so far as it is connected with the question of divine inspiration, equal that of Mark, who wrote his gospel under the auspices of Peter, and it may be said, received the history from the mouth of Peter. Properly speaking much must depend

upon the opinions and traditions of the antient church, and these, we Protestants, when it comes to a question about divine inspiration, do not consider in themselves, as sufficiently decisive. In point of fact we lose nothing but what we may easily concede, namely, the divine inspiration of Luke, and we by these means gain on the other side, for to speak candidly, it is precisely, between Luke and the other three evangelists that we find the most apparent contradictions, which I have never been able, in the course of my lectures to reconcile completely to my own satisfaction, or to derive assistance from critical conjectures, or various readings. When such contradictions occur, reason tells us we ought to adopt the same rules which obtain in every other species of history, and, where the native writers, Matthew, Mark, and John (and who, speaking as a theologian, were besides inspired) to prefer their statements to those of Luke. If it were not, however, of so much consequence to us to reconcile the contradiction, and that we considered Luke as an ordinary human writer, we should at least endeavour to ascertain whether his testimony cannot be made to coincide with the other evangelists? It is clear he speaks of more women than the others; but

were they all at the sepulchre at one and the same time? did they all see one and the same thing? could not some of them, especially those of whom he made inquiries, in consequence of their being eye-witnesses of the fact, have seen what he related? Thus much is certain, that the keepers saw only one angel, that some of the women in Matthew and Mark, saw only one, that Mary Magdalene, according to John, did not at first see any, but afterwards saw two; could not the same thing have happened to others, as for instance, to Joanna, mentioned in the tenth verse? That some of my readers may not too readily agree with me, and go a step further by supposing Luke to describe the appearance of the angels as it occurred to Mary Magdalene, I must remind them, that certain circumstances are here different, as, for instance, Mary Magdalene stands before the sepulchre, according to Luke, the women are in it; she is not terrified by their appearance, but takes them for human beings; the others are very much frightened; her angels sit in the sepulchre, the others stand; her angels give her no information of the resurrection of Jesus, but only inquire why she weeps, the others answer as in the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses.

.7. "*Sinful men.*"] That is, according to the style of Luke, "Heathen or Gentiles." He was to be delivered to the authority of the Gentiles to be crucified.

7—11. Luke does not say either here, or at verse 23, that Jesus showed himself to the women. This circumstance he did not know; and it is possible that some of the women, who did not exactly go and return at the same time, as the others, may have only seen angels. But this opinion I do not maintain; for he who writes out of the country, and has not frequent opportunities of speaking to, and interrogating eye-witnesses, may, very easily, be unacquainted with an important part of history.

9—10. "*To all the rest.*"] Meaning to all the disciples of Jesus—and for Joanna, refer to Luke viii. 3.

JOHN XX. 1—10.

1. "*The first day of the week, cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.*

2. "*Then, she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.*

3. *" Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.*

4. *" So they ran both together; and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.*

5. *" And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.*

6. *" Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie,*

7. *" And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.*

8. *" Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed.*

9. *" For as yet they knew not the Scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead.*

10. *" Then the disciples went away again unto their own home."*

1. As Mary Magdalene alone is here mentioned, it has been commonly supposed that she went by herself to the grave, and not in company with other women: and commentators then give themselves the trouble, which may be thought an unnecessary one, to reconcile John with the other evangelists, from whom it would appear, that several women, amongst whom was Mary Magdalene, went together to the sepul-

chre. The practicability of this, to a certain extent, I am not prepared to deny: several women, according to Luke xxiv. 1—10, went to the grave, perhaps not all together, and therefore it may be said Mary Magdalene was of the number, but the other evangelists are not so circumstantial and clear as John, who was himself an eye-witness, and who illustrated any obscurity in their narratives. But such an apology would give a distinct character to the gospels of Matthew and of Mark, and which I do not conceive necessary. John, it is true, speaks only of Mary Magdalene, but it would seem that he inferred from the other evangelists, as if it were a thing known, that she was in company, for she says, 2d verse, "they have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him." I know that several commentators have given themselves the trouble of explaining this in conformity with their assumed system, but the first and common sense of the words is, that several women were at the sepulchre, and that Mary Magdalene was in company. But now a question arises; why should John mention Mary Magdalene alone? I conceive because he has much to relate of her in detail, which is not

stated by the other evangelists. This is perfectly appropriate to his method of narration. What the preceding evangelists have related with accuracy and fulness he passes by, because he assumes it to be already known from them; but if there is any thing, which appears to him of consequence, he adds it. In this case, however, there is a special reason, as we have observed in chap. xix. 31—37. John was himself an eye-witness of the important fact, that the sepulchre of Jesus was empty on the morning of the third day, and that only the linen clothes and the napkin were lying in it. (5—8.) Now it was impossible for him not to have mentioned this, when he related an event so extraordinary, as the resurrection of a dead person; and every reader will expect from a writer, that he should previously acquaint him with the circumstances, of which he was himself an eye-witness, when he first discovered the fact. If he wishes to relate this fact, he must speak of Mary Magdalene, who ran into the city, brought him to the sepulchre, and gave him an opportunity of becoming an eye-witness of it, especially as he has, in addition, so many remarkable observations, unnoticed by his predecessors.

"*When it was yet dark.*"] This coincides with the other evangelists, and particularly with Luke xxiv. 1, upon which the remarks should be read.

2. As Mary Magdalene runs into the city, it is clear, she must have left the other women, and could not, therefore, have seen what Matthew and Mark have related of them. If, therefore, there is any difference between that, which the other evangelists and John severally relate of Mary Magdalene, this difference is not a contradiction; and this, at once, is an answer to the various objections, founded upon the assertion, that John relates what Mary Magdalene saw, did and heard, in a manner different from what the other evangelists have related of the visions of angels, which appeared unto the women, amongst whom Mary Magdalene was supposed to have been.

"*They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre.*"] As the women found the grave open and empty, and no one near it, the most natural presumption was, that the body had been carried to some other place, and Mary Magdalene states it, as we should do, as a matter of fact, amounting, in her mind, almost to certainty. She is, even to the end of her his-

tory, so fully prepossessed with it, that, in the 15th verse, she inquires of Jesus, whom she takes to be the gardener, where they have laid him. Her supposition, which becomes, in this part, an important clue to the reader, acquires additional light and probability, when we reflect, that the sepulchre did not belong to Joseph, but was selected on account of its proximity. If the dead body was not in the grave, it might be supposed that the proprietor would not suffer it to remain longer than the sabbath, and had caused it to be removed to some other place.

"*We know not.*"] I have already remarked, that Mary Magdalene, when she says, "we," must have come to the grave in company with other women, and not alone. It is singular that commentators, zealous for the Christian religion, and for the divine character of the gospel, should have taken such gratuitous pains to explain this, "We know not," in such a different manner, and to create, as if it were with design, a conflict between John and the other evangelists, which the adversaries of Christianity know not only how to use, but to assume as admitted by its friends.

1st. Some say that the words, "we know not,"

is as much as to say, "I know not, and the probability is, that other women, who may have followed me to the sepulchre, are equally ignorant." But this is prophecy! for could Mary Magdalene think, that others did not know it, when she herself asks in order to obtain the knowledge?

2nd. Heuman says, "no one of his disciples knows it." But had she asked them if they knew it? either Joseph of Arimathea, who had placed him in the sepulchre? or Nicodemus, who had brought the spices? It is not much to understand the expression, "we," of such persons, as had been with her at the sepulchre, and from whom she learnt that they did not know it.

3rd. Polycarp Leyser hazards a conjecture, which is a proof at once of his talents, and of his prejudices, and thinks the original ought to be divided into two words, and to be translated thus:—"I do not know." Some modern writers have been of the same opinion. It is, however, unnecessary, for why should Mary Magdalene go alone to the sepulchre, merely to create a contradiction between John and the other evangelists? Even this improvement of the text, breathes an air of more classical purity,

than it can generally justify. John assumes that the reader of his gospel will have read the others, and therefore he makes additions or explanations, where the previous meaning does not appear sufficiently intelligible. Now if the other evangelists state, that Mary Magdalene went, in company with others to the sepulchre, and John states distinctly in the original Greek, what is clearly translated by "we know not," (*οὐδαμεν. οὐδά μεν*), why should we not conceive this to be correct, especially when it is in conformity with the other evangelists?

3. It is clear that John, Peter, and Mary Magdalene, did not meet the other women at the grave, but that they were alone. It is equally clear, that the other women, who had seen the angels and Jesus, did not meet them upon their return to Jerusalem, or they would otherwise have informed them of what they had seen, and that Peter, John, and Mary Magdalene, when they came to the sepulchre, were ignorant of the resurrection of Jesus. That they did not meet them is not extraordinary in a great city, where many roads lead to the same gate, and where, probably, there were many footpaths between the gardens. For myself, I dwell in a small town, and not far from

the gate, but it would not only be possible to miss any one coming from the cemetery, but probable, because there are not less than seven or eight paths that lead to it. And here the women, who returned, may not have gone directly to the house, from whence Peter, John, and Mary Magdalene came. If they did not meet at the city gates, and Jerusalem had many gates, the probability was they would miss each other.

4—8. In the relation of particulars, John is essentially scrupulous, precisely because he was present, and formed part of the company, that went to the sepulchre, and witnessed such a remarkable fact.

4. The question certainly is unnecessary, why John went first to the sepulchre? When two men run together, one will probably be first. But John, it has been said, was a younger man. I do not think Peter could have been old at the time, for it was about thirty years afterwards, when he wrote his epistles. It may rather be said, in answer to a foolish question, that the ecclesiastical history represents John to have been a good runner, even in his old age, as he is there stated to have run after, and to have overtaken, a robber, with a view to convert him.

5. "*Yet went he not in.*"] So also with another question, "why went he not in?" The best answer is 2 Tim. ii. 23. "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid." If a man goes to a sepulchre, and does not see the body in it, it is clear, as indeed it must have been at the time John went there, why he did not go in. I should not have adverted to this, if some, and even Wetstein, had not given a singular reason for it. "He did not wish to make himself unclean." But to make oneself unclean is not (see my Mosaic Jurisprudence, 207th chapter) sin, and he who goes to a sepulchre to see, whether there is a body in it, certainly has the intention of making himself unclean. Besides this, John was probably levitically unclean; and that, for seven days, for mourning for the dead makes a man unclean. Mary, the mother of Jesus, was in his house, and she, of course, mourned, and he would not have suspended communication with her. Weaknesses of this kind, arising from ignorance of the Jewish law, would not justify notice, except where, by being brought into the pulpit, important passages, such, for instance, as the 17th verse of this chapter, are misrepresented.

7. The Jews did not bury in a coffin, as we

do, but upon an open bier, or truck, which was the reason why a cloth was placed over the face of the dead. Jesus does not appear to have lain upon a bier, because the place was near, and he was buried in haste. The probability is, he lay upon the bare ground, which formed part of the stone or rock in the garden; at least no bier is mentioned to have been found in the place of interment.

8. "*And believed.*"] Namely, that he had arisen from the dead. It does not appear that he communicated this belief at the time to any one. It is extraordinary that some should have said, "he believed that the dead body was not in the grave." Peter, of course, believed it also, for he saw it with his own eyes; and we find in the 5th verse, that John looked into the grave, and finding it empty, did not consider it worth his while to enter, and to look after that which was evidently not there.

10. "*The disciples.*] Namely, Peter and John.

VI. Mary Magdalene sees Jesus after his resurrection, and receives instructions to communicate it to his disciples.

I think I shall make it easier to my readers, if I begin with John, who describes the history accurately and diffusely; and I do this, with the more readiness, because it always remains a doubt, whether that, which we read in Mark xvi. 9, 10, 11, is genuine. But of this, in its place.

John xx. 11—18.

11. "*But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping; and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre.*

12. "*And seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.*

13. "*And they say unto her, woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*

14. "*And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*

15. *" Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*

16. *" Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni, which is to say, Master.*

17. *" Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.*

18. *" Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her."*

12. It is clear from this verse, that the angels, who showed themselves, appeared quickly, and vanished quickly, for neither Peter nor John had previously seen them in the sepulchre, in which sepulchre they had both been: and it is from this alternation of appearance and absence,—from what occurred to the other women, of whom some did not see any angels, some saw one, and others perhaps two, that the evangelists concluded with reason, that they actually were angels, and as such, gave them that name.

But Mary Magdalene seems to have been so entirely absorbed in thought and grief, that her mind did not draw this conclusion; she spoke with them, as mere men, without reflecting, that, (but the instant before,) they were not in the grave. Therefore, if there are here two angels, and only one in Matthew, and in Mark, this produces no contradiction between the evangelists, for it does not relate to one and the same history. The two latter state, what was seen by several women, who were together. John relates that which was seen by Mary Magdalene, who remained after the rest were gone, alone near the sepulchre: and therefore this rapid change in the appearance of the angels is not so absurd, but that, as I have already said, we are justified in concluding from the changes, that they were angels. I do not, myself, for instance, believe in ghosts, but I will suppose, by way of illustration, that my servants, or to come nearer to the mark, that my female servants in the house had seen a ghost dressed in a particular manner: that I should go to the spot where he was said to have been seen, with some instrument in my hand, with a view to ascertain the existence of the fact; and that I found the apparition to be there as had

been stated. I still should not believe in the truth of the story, but insist upon examining the ghost, by forcible means. But if, after having entered the room, where a ghost was said to have been, and which it had no means of getting out of, I found no ghost in the room; if, after having searched in different directions, having applied lights, wherever I could apply them, I still found the room empty; if I remained before the door, and afterwards went a second time into the room, and found two men in it, clothed in a manner that fixed the attention, standing before me, I must have been as strongly, and indeed more strongly, fortified than I am now, in the belief, that there are no ghosts, if I did not believe, that there had been ghosts in that room. If God, upon extraordinary occasions, permits beings of a superior order to be messengers to us mortals, it strikes me as a fair conclusion from such authority, that they would differ, in some respects, from men who have flesh and bone.

"*Sitting, the one at the head, the other at the feet.*"] This is also different from the appearances of the angels, witnessed by the other women, and related by the evangelists.

13. "*My Lord.*"] Mary Magdalene was

of the number of those, who had ministered to him, and who had contributed to provide for him, (Luke viii. 1—3.) She belonged, therefore, in a certain sense, to what we may call the family of Jesus, and in this sense, she may call him "her Lord." The word "Lord" here is not to be understood in the same elevated sense, in which "our Lord" is used for a higher object in the New Testament; according to the Syriac, it is the name given to kings. We may collect, from the direct beginning of the history to this very point, from what the other evangelists relate of the three women, and from the simplicity of the narration itself, that the resurrection of Jesus is not the invention of premeditated hope. The resurrection was not a subject of hope, for, as John says, they did not understand the Scriptures, and knew not that such an event was predicted. Mary Magdalene comes with others to the sepulchre,—they see it contrary to their expectation, open and without a stone. She perceives, that it is empty,—they are at a loss to account for it, and without thinking of a resurrection, they conclude the body to have been taken away. The fact, that the sepulchre was open, unguarded and empty, could not be a question of imagination, and the

only one that remains is, and which might very easily have been answered, (if Jesus were not actually risen,) Where has the body been carried to? Mary Magdalene does not remain with the other women, but hastens back, and brings two men; certainly very judicious in her, but even these men, who had no previous thought about the resurrection, find the grave empty. They go home, the one in a state of confused thought, the other, conceiving there must be something in the resurrection of Jesus, but not mentioning his thoughts to any one. Mary Magdalene remains at the grave, she weeps, she looks into the sepulchre, she perceives the two men in white garments, she does not even reflect, that they were not there before, and they ask her, why she weeps. Without thinking of angels, or of any thing supernatural, and solely engrossed by the loss of the body, which she wishes to take to another sepulchre, in case it was not allowed to remain there, she says, "the body of her Lord is taken away, and she knows not where they have laid him," and she goes away. Is there in this conduct any conception or hope of a resurrection, which could create all this in the brain?

14. "*And knew not, that it was Jesus.*"] We

must combine three circumstances, in order to explain her not knowing Jesus. In the first place, Mary saw him, as appears from the sixteenth verse, not in front, but sideways, for when he addressed her afterwards by the name of "Mary," she turned herself, and said to him, "Rabboni." Besides, she did not expect to see Jesus, but believed him to be dead, and was so occupied with the sole care of finding the body, that she paid attention to nothing else. Either of these circumstances will at times, prevent our recognition of a person, with whom we are acquainted. When we are in great trepidation, as, for instance, in the case of fire, or are searching for something anxiously, and meet a person suddenly, we should not, if we did not expect him, immediately recollect him, although he stood before us.

15. "*If thou hast borne him hence.*"] It would appear, as if she thought the master of the garden, or that the gardener might be desirous, when the Sabbath was past, that the body should not remain longer in the garden, and she therefore wished to provide another grave for him herself.

16. "*Mary.*"] As if surprised, she did not know him. This tone of surprise and fami-

liarity immediately brought him to the recollection of Mary.

" *Rabboni.*"] Rabban is amongst the Jews, more than Rab, and Rabbi. The name arose about the time of the birth of Jesus, and was given, by way of eminence, to the posterity of Hillet, of whom there were seven in number, and who for two hundred years were not only distinguished teachers, but also persons of high magisterial authority. It has been used, however, in a more extensive sense, in the Chaldee Targum. " My Rabban," should be Rabbani, for thus they pronounced it in Judea, and so would a Spanish Jew pronounce it. But Mary Magdalene was from Galilee, and our German Jews, who are of Galilean origin, say, " Rabboni," and thus it stands in the Cambridge manuscript, and in the old Latin translations of Blanchini. But Rabbani is not to be rejected, since the Galileans pronounce the vowels very differently.

17. " *Touch me not.*"] Several improbable explanations of this prohibition have been given. The most common one is by Peter Martyr. According to him, Jesus prohibited her touching him, that she might not be detained, but might convey, without any delay,

the joyful intelligence of his resurrection to his disciples. But this would be extravagant haste, and the economy only of a few moments; besides, she could have brought much more certain intelligence to the disciples, that she had seen not a vision, or a shadow, but the real Jesus, risen from the dead, and actually and palpably alive. Again, if Matthew is to be believed, the disciples must already have had information, through the other women, of the resurrection of Jesus; and how does this coincide with what follows? "Touch me not, haste, lose not a moment, for I am not yet ascended to my Father, but remain for some time upon earth." The supposition of Wetstein is more learnedly artificial, that Jesus reproached her with being afraid to enter the sepulchre, that she might not defile herself, and that Jesus means to say, "Thou art unclean! knowest thou not, that I am High Priest, and that the High Priest must not touch an unclean person?" Not a word of this, however, stands in the discourse of Jesus, and it is inconsistent with the subsequent remark, that he has not yet ascended to his Father. An unclean person would still less venture to touch him, if he had already ascended to the Father, than

if he had still remained on earth with his disciples.* For my own part, I have not made up my mind, how to understand the words, the explanation seems to depend upon this; for what purpose did Mary Magdalene stretch out her hands to touch Jesus? that she did so, is evident, for who would say, "Touch me not," unless another actually did, or attempted to touch him? Of the two fol-

* Every commentator, who ventures upon novelty, has some new absurdity upon this subject. Theophylact, from whom Wetstein probably borrowed it, says, "You must not be so familiar with me as formerly, nor touch me, for I go to my Father." In this case, he would not have said, "for I am not yet ascended to my Father." Besides, such a harsh and severe injunction is little in character, with the mildness of Jesus, and by no means coincides, with the gentle information, "say unto my brethren, I ascend to my Father, and to your Father." Beza has another, and a weaker explanation. He considers Jesus to desire not to be touched bodily, but spiritually, when he should have ascended to his Father, and this he concludes by attacking the Roman Catholics upon the real presence, which they believe to exist in the sacred wafer at the communion. It would be easy to collect more misrepresentations of this text, but I shall content myself with saying, that these words in the hands of the commentators have been very unsatisfactorily treated.

lowing explanations, the one has been never, and the other rarely given, but both are attended with difficulty.

1. Will Mary Magdalene touch him, in order to ascertain, whether it is a real body with flesh and bone, or merely a vision—a phantom, a spirit, a glorified heavenly being? (and in visions, the Jews, like the rest of mankind, had then great faith,) then the meaning would be clear, "Thou dost not require to touch me, in order to be convinced, that mine is a real body; it is the same; I am risen from the grave, and with the same earthly body, with which I was laid in it. At my ascension I shall receive another and a glorified body, but I am not yet ascended to my Father, who is in heaven." This is the explanation which Pfaff has given upon this subject, and which I used in my lectures from 1750 to 1782, until another explanation occurred to me in the course of writing this work, to which I am inclined to attach more importance.

2. If Mary Magdalene wished to embrace the feet of Jesus, as (Matthew xxviii. 9,) the women did, from a deep sense of reverence, and an ardent desire for grace, seeing, as she now

did, one risen from the dead—one whom she might well believe to be a heavenly being, then the words spoken by Jesus have another signification; "Be not afraid of me, and do not pray for grace, because you have seen me; do not worship me yet divinely, for I am not now descended from heaven, but am upon earth, amongst mortal beings; but I shall ascend to heaven, and do you announce it to my brethren, that I shall still acknowledge them as my brethren, for my Father, to whom I ascend, is also their Father." In this case, the answer corresponds to what Jesus said to the other women, Matthew xxviii. 10, when they embraced his knees, "Be not afraid." I will not deny, that the last explanation is the most satisfactory to me, and it occurred to me, in consequence of the contradiction which a writer, an enemy of Christianity, assumes between John xx. 17, and Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, and which has induced me to look more closely into the question. Of this supposed contradiction I will now speak, and which, after all, is mere quibbling. It is asserted, that "to wish to be touched, and not to be touched, is an evident contradiction." I should say, that a be-

ginner in logic must know this is no contradiction, except accompanied with this condition, "that to be touched, and not to be touched by the same person, and at the same time, is an evident contradiction." I may wish to be led by a person, if I am very ill, but upon subsequent consideration, I may be desirous to retract the wish; and the proposition here is without the condition, that Jesus desired, that the other women, and that the Apostles should touch him. The objections are not consistent with the first principles of logic. The following are the reasons given by the writer, why Jesus wished to be touched.

1. "The women lay hold of his feet," Matthew xxviii. 9. I conceive, that John states this, in the first instance, as applying also to Mary Magdalene, and the thing, indeed, speaks for itself. For I should scarcely say, "Touch me not," to a person who makes no ostensible motion, as if with a view to touch me, and who does not for this purpose extend his hand. Indeed, no man, except he had the gout, would cry out in this unnecessary manner. By the way, I must observe, that Küster's manu-

script, and an important one, as well as the Philoxenian version, has this passage, "And she ran forward to meet him."

2. Jesus says to the women, "Be not afraid." But is this the light in which the writer understands it? Does he mean, "Be not afraid to touch my feet." I should hardly think so. But supposing it to have this meaning, the histories are still different! The women did it at another time, and, perhaps, with another view, and Mary Magdalene did it again at a distinct time. Is it a contradiction, if Jesus does not prohibit them, and says to Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not"? for instance, he might have permitted the women to embrace his feet from veneration, and still say to Mary Magdalene, who might be desirous of touching him, in order to ascertain whether he was a mere vision, or a real body, "It is not necessary for you to touch me." But if the women and Mary Magdalene, from the same principle of veneration, and of hope, wished to embrace the feet of Jesus, then, as I have already shown, the words, "Touch me not," and "Be not afraid," convey the same meaning.

3. Christ had even commanded his disciples,

(Luke xxiv. 39,) and Thomas, (John xx. 27,) to touch him. Certainly he does so, because they did not believe him to be the same Jesus, and Thomas, the doubting Thomas, had made the requisition; but is it therefore an invention of the historian, and such an historian as John, from whom we have this story of Thomas, if he relates Jesus to have forbidden this to Mary Magdalene, under different circumstances? Objections to religion should be made upon fair and honourable grounds, and not be so designedly strained, as they are in the present instance.

"*My brethren.*"] Jesus explains this by what follows: "to my Father, and to your Father." Jesus in his glory, and now no longer upon earth, will consider those who believe in him, as his brethren.

I will now reduce to as short a compendium as I can, and as far as I can understand them, the narrations of the four evangelists. Several women, amongst whom was Mary Magdalene, went together to the grave of Jesus, and, perhaps, some others, mentioned by Luke, followed. They found to their astonishment, the grave open and empty. Mary Magdalene,

without waiting for the solution of this mystery, ran immediately back to Jerusalem, in order to acquaint Peter and John. Both ran with her to the grave. In the mean time, the other women had seen an angel, who told them that Jesus lived, and commanded them to announce it to his disciples. Upon their return, Jesus himself appeared to them, and gave them a similar order to the disciples; they did not meet Peter, John, and Mary Magdalene, but these three, without having heard any thing from the other women, came to the grave. Peter and John returned to Jerusalem, when they had sufficiently examined the grave, and proved that it was empty; but Mary Magdalene remained, and now she saw for the first time, two angels in the grave, but whom she did not know to be angels; then Jesus, whom she supposed to be the gardener, but whom she knew from his addressing her by the name of Mary; she then spoke to him, and received from him commands for his disciples. Thus, no evangelist is at variance with another. It is not, therefore, necessary to go into any further cavil, for where two, if not three distinct histories are mingled together, it is not

surprising, that after such a mixture, the adversaries of Christianity should be able to raise contradictions.

MARK XVI. 9, 10, 11.

Before I enter into an explanation of these verses, I must first speak of the last eight verses of this chapter, (v. 9—16,) they are found, it is true, in all the Greek manuscripts, which we have, of which, however, no one is older than the sixth century, nay more, all the old translations have them, even the Latin, and the Syriac made in the first century; therefore, whether genuine or added, they appear to be very old. But several Greek manuscripts have an observation upon them, though not always in the same words, yet in substance as follows, "These words are wanting in many," or rather, "in the greater number of older manuscripts, and Eusebius has declared the gospel of Mark to be canonical only as far as the words 'they were afraid.'" Other commentators consider them as genuine, and say, "they exist in the best manuscripts," but they observe at the same time, "they are wanting in many other manuscripts;" and they add,

that many older manuscripts, have, instead of these words, those already brought forward, (p. 144, 145,) at the end of the gospel. Whoever wishes to know the exact Greek words, and the manuscripts, in which these observations are contained, will find them in Wetstein. But what is most important is, that these eight verses did not exist in the time of Jerome, 1400 years ago in all the manuscripts of the Latin translation, and, in general, in few Greek manuscripts. His own words are worthy of being quoted; they relate directly to the three verses of Mary Magdalene, in which Hedibia found a contradiction, and proposed it as his third question. The answer of Jerome was, (Book 4, p. 172, Benedictine Edition, Quest. 3,) "The solution of this ques-
"tion is two-fold. For either we do not re-
"ceive the testimony of Mark, which is con-
"tained in but few gospels, and almost all the
"Greek books have not this chapter at the
"end, chiefly because it seemed to relate
"things, different from, and contrary to the
"other gospels." Under these circumstances, and as this passage existed in the fourth century only in a few Greek manuscripts, it be-

comes, in fact, very doubtful. So much may be said both for and against these passages, that at last they only become more uncertain; as, for instance, in *favour* of the last verses.

1. It is scarcely conceivable, that the gospel of Mark should end with the eighth verse. "For they were afraid," is surely an uncommon ending for a book, but the history itself is still more abrupt, for Mark stops in the middle of the history of the women going to the sepulchre. An angel appears to them, and says, Jesus is risen; that they are to announce this to his disciples, and to Peter. Jesus himself, however, had not appeared to them; they tell the disciples nothing; and yet how is Mark to know what he relates of the grave being found empty, and of their vision of angels? Is Jesus risen or is he not? If the gospel stops here, then the principal part of what he is desirous to relate, is precisely wanting.

2. There is nothing either in the language or construction, different from the style of Mark, and therefore it does not betray itself, as in the passages I have quoted, (see p. 144, 145,) to be surreptitious. But, on the other

hand, it may be said, that it does not contain that, which, according to the tenor of the history, we might expect from Mark. His custom is, as I have observed in my introductio to the New Testament, to dwell particularly on the circumstances which affect Peter, and that he would do so, we had a right to expect from his mention of him in the seventh verse: but we have nothing of the kind; particularly when we combine with it the following circumstances.

1. Peter had visited the grave himself, had examined it, and found it empty. (John xx. 2—9, Luke xxiv. 12.)

2. Jesus appeared specially to Peter, and sooner than to the other apostles. (Luke xxiv. 34. 1 Cor. xv. 5.) Upon both these circumstances, it is improbable that Mark would have been silent, or have not gone into detail.

If these were the only grounds for, or against the passage, it might, perhaps, lead to the following result:—I have said, in my introduction to the New Testament, that Mark may have given out two editions of his gospel, the first at Rome, and the second in Egypt. We might then say, that the first edition ended with the words, "for they were afraid;" and

that when Mark had arrived at this passage, Peter was either crucified, or Mark prohibited access to him, and as he wrote from the dictation of Peter, and his gospel was to be, to a certain extent, the gospel of Peter, (2 Peter i. 15,) he ceased to write here, and left his gospel imperfect. But as he preached it several years afterwards in Egypt, and delivered it in a written form to believers, he put this appendix to it, but in such a manner, that he omitted every thing, which related specifically to Peter, because he could no longer have it from his own mouth. Now there are two circumstances, which are so much at variance with Mark's usual habit of writing, or with what we should expect from Mark, that they are not to be solved by this hypothesis.

1. Mark is in the habit of following Matthew so closely, even in words, that it may be perceived he writes, with the gospel of Matthew lying before him. At the ninth verse the character of the narration assumes a different appearance, as if the writer had neither seen or read the gospel of Matthew.

2. In two passages, the one chap. xiv. 28, and the other chap. xvi. 7, Mark relates the promise that Jesus should show himself to his

disciples in Galilee, annexed to the command that they should go to Galilee; if he had finished his own gospel, and if this latter appendix, say, of the second edition, were from his own hand, he would not have forgotten to have said something of this important vision. But there is no mention of it, and thus it becomes probable, that he was stopped at the eighth verse, either by the death of Peter, or because he had no longer access to him, and that the conclusion of the gospel is from a hand, unknown to us. At all events, it must be very old, and of the first century, because it is found in all old translations, but which were not, however, made before the death of Mark. That it contains much of what is true, is highly probable, as for instance, in the fifteenth and sixteenth verses, for much might have been known of the history and of the doctrine of Jesus as exemplified by his words, by verbal communications, between the death of Mark, and the end of the first century. At the same time such communications would be liable to errors. The addition is certainly not from the hand of John, to whom, perhaps, suspicion might attach, but it is by no means in his style, it coincides too little with what

John has himself written, and especially at the fourteenth verse, in which we cannot trace, whether the recorded appearance of Jesus is on the day of the resurrection or eight days afterwards, a distinction, which John who is so remarkably precise in his narration, so guardedly defines. To speak, therefore, in the most diffident manner, it is still a question of uncertainty, and it becomes impossible to say, whether the conclusion of this gospel is from the pen of Mark, or from the hand of some unknown person; and from this, it appears to me, two consequences follow.

1. That from this appendix we can take no passages as doctrinal grounds of faith, with certainty. It is true, that if Jesus actually said every thing, which is brought forward in this appendix, as the words of Jesus, the words would be infallible, and would be a ground of faith; but as we are not certain who has compiled them, they create in our minds no more conviction than any verbal tradition of the words of Jesus of the first century. I concur, therefore, in the opinion of Cardinal Cajetan, which Wetstein has given us with his various readings: "Whichever way the truth may be, still the effect of these suspicions is to diminish that

solid authority which matters of faith require, and which renders this part of the gospel of inferior value to the undoubted writings of Mark."

2. If even there were any real contradiction between this appendix and the other evangelists, and which is not easily to be reconciled, it is still different from other contradictions. It does not affect the truth of the history, but only remains the contradiction of an anonymous writer. It is not even included in the doctrine of our theologians, who say that the New Testament and the evangelists are inspired, because we do not know from whose hands the words are, and whether they belong to the New Testament. This, however, does not prevent us from examining whether the contradictions can be reconciled; this justice is due to an anonymous, and a mere human writer, nor should we attribute contradiction even to one who has been convicted of errors, where no contradiction exists.

Here follow the words:

9. "*Now when Jesus was risen early, the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.*

10. *" And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept.*

11. *" And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not."*

9. *" Early."*] I have already said the Greek word signifies the morning before sunrise to the first commencement of the dawn. Mark, if I can give this name to an unknown writer, describes the manner in which Jesus showed himself to Mary Magdalene, much more briefly than John; this is not to be wondered at, for it is the custom of John to enter more into detail, and to relate circumstances with more precision than his predecessors. The contradiction which exists with the other evangelists, and which I know not how to reconcile, has been discussed in my observations on Mark xvi. 8, p. 140—147.

" Out of whom he had cast seven devils."] This might be considered as the unauthentic language of an unknown composer, and may be argued to disprove the genuineness of the text, but it is met with in Luke viii. 2, and is probably taken from him. The sense of the words is uncertain, the meaning may be,

1. That the devil should have said " there

are seven of us," as in Mark v. 9, " our name is Legion, for we are many;" or,

2. That after relapsing into her former sins, she had again fallen into the possession of the devil, and been seven times successively delivered from him; or,

3. That she had been delivered from seven severe natural disorders, termed possessions by the devil, and which were, perhaps, seven hysteric and spasmodic attacks.

Here it is not possible for me to give any opinion, nor even to lay before my readers what appears to me the probable solution of this question, since I have had no opportunity of discussing the words " possessed by a devil," and those who have written upon the subject come to no conclusion, and refer us to no authority. In fact, the question belongs more properly to Luke, who was not only no anonymous, but a medical writer.

VII. Luke's special Narration of Peter.

Luke xxiv. 12.

12. "*Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre, and stooping down he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.*"

That this is the same story with John xx. 2—10, every reasonable man will soon see, only John, who was present, relates it as an eye-witness, with more accuracy.

1. Here it is said, "Peter ran unto the sepulchre." John not only mentions the approach to the tomb, but that he also went with him, and arrived there before Peter.

2. Luke has only "stooping down," as far as relates to Peter; but John did still more, he went in himself. In this I see no contradiction, nor have the enemies of Christianity seen any; it only shows the greater accuracy with which an eye-witness speaks of a transaction.

3. In Luke we see "the linen clothes alone," independent of the dead body. John adds only the slight circumstance, that he saw the cloth

which was over the face, wrapped up, and lying in a place by itself. This is no contradiction. The enemies of Christianity contend that there is here a contradiction between Luke and John, for, according to John, Peter went to the tomb before Mary Magdalene had seen an angel, but according to Luke, the women had already seen an angel at the sepulchre, and had communicated to his disciples the information which the angel had given them of Jesus having risen from the grave. But supposing the contradiction to remain unanswered, Luke is the only evangelist who loses by it; it would be his error, and John, who had read the gospel of Luke before he composed his own, corrects the error by his superior accuracy. But, in point of fact, I see no contradiction; because Luke relates that Peter ran to the grave, subsequently to the return of the women, it does not therefore follow that he ran there immediately after their return; it may have taken place, and this is in conformity with John, during the time that the women were still at the sepulchre, and when Mary Magdalene had alone returned Luke: probably was not acquainted with this circumstance; he was no eye-witness, he would otherwise have mentioned it. But he does not

say, therefore, what is untrue, for he did not promise to write a journal of minutes and of hours, and he may have ended the history of the women when they first went to the sepulchre. He then proceeds to relate the arrival of Peter, without, however, stating, or probably knowing, what was the cause of his running to the sepulchre. I do not deny, if we had Luke alone, we might conceive Peter to have run down to the grave in the first instance, when the women had brought back into the city the account of the vision of angels, but even then this would have created some doubt, as Luke would naturally have added, "that he, Peter, had found no angel," but it is upon this account also, that an eye-witness gives more correctness to the history, that is, he does not show that Luke wrote an untruth, but he only relates with more detailed accuracy, so that every fact may be appropriated to its proper place. A doubt, however, of another kind, not against Luke, but against the perfect fidelity of our copied text, arises at this verse. I have already alluded to it in my Introduction to the New Testament, it would seem as if something were wanting—namely, a narration of the appearance of Jesus, whom, according to 1 Cor. xv. 5, and even ac-

cording to Luke xxiv. 34, Peter is stated to have seen on the first day. It is inconceivable that Luke should have made the apostles say, "The Lord is indeed risen, and has appeared to Simon," without having communicated some circumstances connected with this appearance to his readers, and this silence is the more extraordinary, as he had been previously speaking of Peter, and related his surprise at the sepulchre having been found empty. Nor do I see rightly what this verse means, if it is not intended for the beginning of a more important narration. It is clear with what view John relates Peter running to the sepulchre, examining it minutely, and finding it empty. But the whole connection, so obvious in John, is here lost, it is not even mentioned that John and Mary Magdalene were present at the time; why this history, which without the connection loses its importance, is here related, is scarcely imaginable, except as an introduction to one more important, namely, that Jesus relieved Peter from his embarrassment, and appeared himself unto him. If this history had commenced with "And behold," the omission would have been conceivable, as the narration in the succeeding 13th verse, of the disciples going to Emmaus

commences equally with the same words, but this omission must have been very ancient, as the information which we require to supply it, is not to be found in any manuscript, nor in any old translation. I know not how to make this general loss in any way so conceivable, as by supposing the copy of Luke, which the first compiler of the writings of the New Testament obtained, and carried into his collection, to have been already without this addition, and indeed I think it may be said, that the copy of Luke's writings such as it is come down to us, seems to be more deficient than any other book of the New Testament. Was it wanting in the copy which John had in his hands, when he wrote his gospel? I should be inclined to think so, for otherwise, according to his peculiar mode of writing, John would probably have said something of the appearance to Peter, and many years elapsed between the time of writing his gospel, and the period when the collective writings of the apostles were first united after his death in one book.

VIII. THE KEEPERS OF THE SEPULCHRE BRING INFORMATION TO THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WHAT THEY HAVE SEEN: AND AGREE, UPON RECEIVING MONEY, TO SPREAD THE REPORT, THAT THE DEAD BODY OF JESUS WAS STOLEN AWAY FROM THE SEPULCHRE, BY HIS DISCIPLES, WHILST THEY WERE ASLEEP.

MATTHEW XXVIII. 11—15.

11. *" Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done.*

12. *" And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers,*

13. *" Saying, Say ye, his disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept.*

14. *" And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you.*

15. *" So they took the money, and did as they were taught; and this saying is commonly reported amongst the Jews until this day."*

11. *" Some of the watch."*] It has been singularly enough asked, why did not all the guard go? I should suppose, because it did

not stand under the immediate orders of the high priest, and therefore, it was not necessary for them to go. But the whole guard could not go at once. The Romans had the custom of ordering upon guard four times as many men as were necessary to give four reliefs, or four turns of duty, namely, four times in the day, and four times in the night. Now supposing the guard, as in Acts xii. 4, to have consisted of sixteen men, then all the four would go, who had stood sentry, between three and six in the morning, but supposing the guard to have been stronger, say forty men, which may have been, if the chief priest did not consider four sentries sufficient to keep off the many admirers of Jesus, then probably some of those who stood sentry at the time would have gone.

"*Came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests.*"] The German, and even the English translation of the Greek, are here not entirely blameless, and have, consequently, not been unnoticed by the adversaries of Christianity. A person reading the common text, might suppose that the guard and the women entered the city at the same time, but literally construed it would be "whilst they, the women, were going away, some of the guard, who had entered the

city, announced the events of the resurrection to the chief priests." Before the women came to the sepulchre, the guards had run away from it, in the direction of the city, so that by the time the women were returning, they had brought to the chief priests, the unwelcome intelligence of the great change that had taken place. The chief priests, therefore, in point of fact, received intelligence of the resurrection of Jesus, somewhat earlier than his disciples.

"*To the chief priests.*"] The chief priests, in the extensive sense of the word, are those priests who were members of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. Probably no one would fancy, that the keepers went to all these separately; Caiaphas and Hannas, (Luke iii. 2.,) who were the most active enemies of Jesus, were most likely those, who applied for a guard, and to whom therefore the soldiers addressed themselves; and they would have retained the secret themselves, without permitting the soldiers to disseminate the report, through the houses of the other priests. Caiaphas was in the real sense of the word, the high priest appointed by the Roman governor: Hannas, his father-in-law, had been so before him, but had been set aside by

the Romans. He retained, however, in the eyes of the Jews, the respect due to a chief priest, as his five sons and his son-in-law, administered after him, this high dignity. In the same way as the captive Jesus had been brought, in the first instance, before Hannas as a private man, (John xviii. 13.,) so by this important event Hannas would have been brought into consultation with Caiaphas, both as to hearing the guard, and receiving the original report.

12. "*And when they were assembled with the elders.*"] This has been commonly understood to mean an assemblage of the high council at Jerusalem, and in fact, from this view of it, has proceeded one of the most violent, and at the same time, one of the worst objections of infidelity. But the words of Matthew do not convey this meaning. The high council of Jerusalem consisted of three kinds of members.

1. Priest, who, as soon as they had a seat in the college, obtained the name of chief priests, a circumstance which I must explain in another place, and for which I here beg indulgence. The chief priests were, generally, of the sect of the Sadducees. Hannas and Caiaphas certainly were so.

2. The chiefs of the twelve tribes, and probably the chiefs or heads of other families. These were called "elders."

3. Learned men by profession. They are termed, in the Bible, scribes. Amongst them there were many Pharisees. If we are now to distinguish the high council, or synod, according to its classes, we should say with the evangelists, "the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes." It will be immediately perceived that the third class of members are not all named, and he who has read the Acts of the Apostles with any attention, (ch. iv. 1, 2. v. 34—39. xxiii. 6, 7, 8,) will easily see, that the Sadducean high priests could not have had much inclination to convey the intelligence of the reported resurrection of a dead man to Pharisees, who would, probably, have defended it from a principle of party. The words, however, do not convey any thing of the kind, and, indeed, such an assembly of the whole Sanhedrim, would have been so completely ineffectual, that the idea is not to be entertained. In fact, this would have created a great sensation, when the object of the chief priests was to secure the utmost tranquillity and secresy. The transaction must have been known to so many, that humanly

speaking, perfect silence was not to be expected; nay, even in the Sanhedrim, there was a certain member known to be attached to Jesus, Nicodemus, for instance, to whom Hannas and Caiaphas would not have communicated the intelligence, which the keepers gave, and whom they could not, without considerable offence, have excluded, if they had convened the whole council. I conceive the case to have been, that Hannas and Caiaphas held a private meeting at one of their own houses, to which some elders, but only the most confidential, were invited, and consulted, what was to be done. The article, (*των πρεσβυτερων*,) "with *the* elders," does not say expressly that *all* the elders were present: but even the article, as it is in the Greek, is not from Matthew, but his translator, and it might have been with "elders."

12. A question has here been raised, how could Matthew have known this, when the soldiers said, what the chief priests had previously enjoined them. The answer is easy. If we suppose the gospel of Matthew to have been written early, it must have been written within at least eight years after the event, and all the soldiers could for eight years have scarcely continued in the same story under the

impression of money alone; their comrades, either in a moment of ridicule at their incredible fit of sleeping, or even in confidence, or in a state of elevation from liquor, must have heard the truth, so that the mystery was gradually known, and Matthew and the disciples of Christ became acquainted with it. It has been observed, even by the enemies of Christianity, that the soldiers, if they had been pressed upon the subject, would hardly have kept the real truth from their own countrymen. The probability is, they would have related the marvellous history to their friends, upon the principle, that the more extraordinary the history, the more difficult the concealment.

"*Large money.*"] Literally, sufficiently numerous shekels of silver, and probably as many shekels of silver as they required. The Greek word in the plural signifies "shekels," but in the Cambridge manuscript it is in the singular, "silver," and silver is money.

13. The words are not so to be understood, as if the soldiers had themselves seen the disciples steal the dead body, for such a fiction, although it has been alleged by some writers, would be too contradictory, but that they were all asleep; the first who wakes, sees the grave

open; he awakes the others, they find the grave empty; the dead body must have been stolen in the interval, and none, but the adherents of Jesus, could have stolen it; but even it remains a very improbable narration, that several soldiers, at the least four, should have been sentries from three to six, that they should all have fallen asleep, and so soundly too, that the disciples should have been able to roll away the great stone from the grave, and carry away the dead body, without being perceived; this is not probable.

14. Pilate was to be easily softened down with money, and he was, besides, desirous of gratifying the chief priests, because he was afraid his exactions in Judea might be a subject of complaint at Rome.

15. "*And this saying is commonly reported amongst the Jews until this day.*"] It it satisfactory to us, to know the real objections, which the Jews of those days made to the resurrection of Jesus, and as Matthew wrote in Palestine, we may be tolerably well assured, what was the real objection, and the current rumour of Jerusalem. If this saying, "that the disciples of Jesus had stolen his body, whilst the keepers slept," had not been current

in Jerusalem, Matthew would not have had the confidence to have written it, and to have exposed himself both to Jews and Christians, as an evident liar, since every reader would immediately have said, that, of such a report, they had not heard one syllable. But if this was, in point of fact, the town talk of Jerusalem, and the objection of the enemies of Christianity, two propositions became essentially confirmed by the admission of its adversaries.

1st. The sepulchre was, up to the third day, under a guard of Roman soldiers, and

2nd. The same sepulchre was at the commencement of the third day found open, empty, and without a dead body.

Justin Martyr in his correspondence accuses the Jews of having sent people into all parts of the world to propagate the story of the stolen body. But this does not appear probable to me, as the other evangelists, who wrote out of Palestine, do not find it necessary to mention the report. It could not have been so at Rome, Alexandria, or Ephesus, Acts xxviii. 21, 22. Justin Martyr, in historical facts, is not the most authentic writer, whom

one should believe, without scruple. The enemies of Christianity contend,

1. That it is not likely a numerous and learned body should consist of intentional deceivers, who bribe soldiers to speak to an evident falsehood.

2. Nicodemus was a member of the synod, and must have given his vote for the propagation of the falsehood. To this it must be answered, that he would have exposed the falsehood, if he had been present at the consultation, and the riches and respectability, for which he is celebrated in the Talmud, would have given him the means, if the fear of man had not overpowered him.

3. The discourse of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34—39,) would be unintelligible, if the high council itself, as well as Gamaliel, who speaks here, already knew for a certainty, the resurrection of Jesus. All these objections vanish, as long as we suppose, without reference to Matthew, that the meeting of the Sanhedrim was not general. These objections are merely fanciful, or the result of bad illustrations, heard in youth, never proved in age, and then adopted as the genuine sense of Matthew. It is true,

that such miserable illustrations are the cause of most of the objections which have been raised against the Bible, and because the history of the resurrection has been explained and tortured from the pulpit by people who have never learnt the rules of right reasoning, the great majority of doubts have risen. But these are objections, not to Matthew, but to the manner of illustrating him. The other arguments are—

1. If the resurrection is true, why did not the apostles appeal to the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem? why did they not appeal to foreigners, to synagogues, to tribunals, against this report of the keepers? Why did they not require a judicial examination of the soldiers before Pilate? For the keepers, although they had received money, would still have had no scruple of telling the truth before their own countrymen. Now, as nothing of this kind was done, it follows that the narration of Matthew must be an imposture.

Such is the general objection. The answer must be more detailed. The apostles were in the first year several times before the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. (Acts iii. iv. v.) Why did they not then appeal to the Judges, that they should

really state the truth, and permit an examination of the soldiers. The answer is easy: because they themselves were ignorant of what Matthew only knew eight, or perhaps even fourteen, years afterwards, and because the keepers themselves had divulged the story. But even then, if they had known it, it would have been very unwise to have relied on the examination of a corrupt soldiery, who would have been still more decided in their statement, especially if the chief priests gave them more money. But if the question is of foreign synagogues, as for instance in Asia Minor, in Macedonia, or in Greece, or before the tribunals in those countries, before which Paul was conducted, (Acts xiii. 16, 17, 18,) the objection becomes ridiculous. The apostle was to rely upon unknown Roman soldiers, who lay in garrison at Jerusalem, and whom no one knew there. The judges might tell by the appearance of Paul, whether he looked like an honest man, but with respect to the soldiers they could not tell whether they existed or not? He was to require from the multitude before whom he preached, or from the judges, who dismissed his accusers, and who considered the charge as so unfounded, that they released him the next day, that they

should apply to the governor in Palestine, for an examination of the soldiers. The petition would have been ridiculous; a governor of Palestine would not have been influenced by such an application, and the persons who made it would have been treated with contempt. Paul, besides, remained too short a time in a town to enable the effect to be produced. Again: he was not accused by the Roman authorities in Greece, upon the ground of the resurrection of Christ, (at Philippi, for instance, he was attacked because he had destroyed the gains of a family, and because he wished to preach a king independent of Cæsar,) and even in Palestine, Festus in relating the accusation of the Jews, adverts to the expression of Paul "of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive," with a kind of ridicule, because it belongs to no legal tribunal. The name of Pilate is unfortunately mixed with the objection, and no really learned man would here use it. No governor, even with a favourable feeling towards Jesus, had such strong reasons to reject an examination of the keepers, and which he was not judicially required to do, since no one was personally accused of stealing the dead body; and to examine witnesses as to whether

any one was risen from the dead, is, as far as we are acquainted with the duties incumbent upon magistrates, not within their line of duty. But independent of this, Pilate, who was merely at Jerusalem during the time of the Easter Feast, did not return to Jerusalem, but was sent the next year, just before the death of Tiberius, a prisoner to Italy, by Vitellius, a governor of Syria, in consequence of the complaints of the Jews; therefore during the time of his having been in Palestine, little could have been either known or reported of the bribery of the guard, or of what they saw at the sepulchre of Jesus. Pilate had no immediate successor, but Vitellius assumed the government of Palestine, and he was so attached to the Jews, that a complaint of this kind, addressed to him would have been the highest absurdity. Proofs of this attachment to the Jews and to their religion may be seen in Josephus. (Antiquities b. 18, c. 4, sect. 2, 3.) Still, however, the adversaries of Christianity maintain, (and I shall examine the objection,) "That the disciples of Jesus, accused as they were of theft, were bound in honour to investigate the accusation, and compel an examination of the guard." But this is an ignorance of the civil laws. Such a claim might probably have been

made, but it was of little weight, especially when brought forward by persons of inferior condition; but jurists, acquainted with the old laws, inform me that no such positive right existed, that it was not in the old Roman law, but that it was founded on the comments of their doctors. But against whom and by whom was this complaint to be preferred? against the soldiers? I conceive they would have continued stedfast in their assertions of their having been asleep, especially when confirmed by the stimulus of money. Against the chief priests? but when they stood before the council, the chief priests do not allege against them the imputation of having purloined the dead body. All ground of complaint is, therefore, here done away. There remains, consequently, nothing but a local rumour against which they would have had to make their complaint, and a complaint of this kind would certainly have been most extraordinary.

And who is to make this complaint? "His disciples stole him!" This does not apply exclusively to the eleven apostles, but generally to the disciples and adherents of Jesus. No one is mentioned individually, therefore no one can complain of his being the designated person.

If, for instance a dead body was missed in this town, and a rumour was circulated, that the surgeons had stolen it from the grave, and dissected it, would the students in medicine be justified in bringing forward a complaint against an individual? The answer would naturally be, "Your name has not been mentioned, nor is it alleged that you are the person." It would amount to this, that the whole college of surgeons, being an incorporated body, should make a regular official complaint, but which complaint no lawyer, except one who looked solely to his fees, would advise; and by analogy, that all Christians should have united against this report, at least all those who, previous to the death of Jesus, were either his avowed or his secret adherents. The Christians, however, were neither a corporate or a recognized body; and what a triumph it would have been for the enemies of Christianity to have been the object of a complaint, which a very little ingenuity or corruption on the part of the chief priests would have turned into ridicule? And, besides, it may be presumed that many who were privately disciples of Jesus, would not have eagerly seized this opportunity of uniting themselves so openly with the apostles, whilst on the other hand, the

apostles had nothing to lose by subjecting their persons and their faith to such a trial. Amongst the former, I include Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, upon whom suspicion would more probably have fallen; and even if the secret disciples of Jesus had not appeared, but only his recognized followers, still the answer would have been easy, "We do not mean you, Jesus has other disciples." The enemies of Christianity little thought of the strong proof they were affording Christians of the truth of the resurrection, and of the necessity in which they placed Christians to examine and to use it.

If such a report was current in the city, (and that it was so is evident from Matthew having had the courage to record it in Palestine,) and if the soldiers circulated this report, it is inconceivable that the presiding authorities, that the chief priests did not institute an inquiry, and request an examination of the guard from the Roman general. The grave was empty, before which Roman soldiers had stood sentry, in order that the last error might not be worse than the first. It was worse now, for the apostles preached openly that Jesus was risen, and this preaching created a great revolution,

first in Palestine, and next in the whole world, But of this last I will not speak.

If such a deceit had been practised, and excited such a strong sensation, most civil magistrates possessed of common sense, attacked as they were in the tenderest point, would feel it their duty to call upon the Roman governors for an examination and punishment of the guard who had so slept upon their post. They would besides, in their own judicial capacity, (and the disciples of Jesus were completely within their jurisdiction) have instituted a very close investigation into "who stole the body, and to where the body was carried?" But if nothing of this kind takes place, the magistrates have a very bad case, they depend upon the report of a guard which, upon examination, may turn out to their disadvantage. One steady authentic examination, and a formal statement of the proceedings, together with the punishment of the soldiers, would have put an end to the whole history of the resurrection. Pilate, from the consciousness of his transgressions, was very dependent upon the Jews, and Vitellius was a warm friend to them; if the keepers had repeated upon examination

what they are reported to have said in their general intercourse with others, the disciples of Jesus, and even Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea must have been taken up, and, according to the custom of the Romans, put perhaps to the torture in order to discover the truth. But not a word of this do we find. There must have been some special reason, some mystery, peculiarly known to the chief priests, that they did not institute an inquiry, when it was so easy to have done it, and by these means, extinguish at once the fable of the resurrection, and the rising sect of Christians. The more public the investigation, the better it would have been for the chief priests.

5. Matthew alone relates the history, the other evangelists omit it.

I have never thought this extraordinary, for what connection is there between a local objection to the resurrection, founded upon a report current at Jerusalem, and the absence of such a report in distant cities, in which the others wrote? Matthew is a most authentic witness to this point, namely, to the report prevalent in his time, that the disciples had stolen the dead body of Jesus, whilst the keepers were asleep. If the report had not been current in

his time, he could not have written it, when he was himself in Palestine, still less in Hebrew, without subjecting himself to the charge of wilful and unqualified falsehood. Mark, on the other hand, would have safely written it at Rome; Luke at any other place; and John, after the destruction of Jerusalem, at Ephesus. But their testimony of what was a prevailing report at Jerusalem, is no more than the testimony of men whom, we, in other respects, may believe to be honest men. One word more: from whom do the enemies of Christianity require, that this information is to proceed, namely, of the soldiers going to the chief priests, and of being bribed by them? From John? His general mode is to omit what his predecessors have mentioned, and in this point of view, his silence is confirmation. Where there is a deficiency to supply, or an obscurity to rectify, he does so. From Mark? His gospel stops in the middle of the history of the women, and at the end of the eighth verse is broken off. Luke, therefore, alone remains. But if the silence of Luke forms an objection to the history of a writer, who was himself present and resident at Jerusalem, the admission of this objection would prove that the history was not true; and it would rest

upon this, that a writer, not resident in the country, who states in the beginning of his work, that he writes entirely from the information of others, has not mentioned a circumstance, which circumstance does not, in any degree, relate to parties who were at a distance from Jerusalem.

IX. Jesus shows himself alive to two Disciples, travelling to Emmaus.

Mark xvi. 12—13. Luke xxiv. 13—34.

Mark xvi. 12—13. "*After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.*

"*And they went and told it unto the residue, nei ther believed they them.*"

12. "*In another form.*"] Henman thinks that this alludes only to a different garment, which was the reason they did not know him. But the Greek word is not confined to clothing, it extends to the appearance both of the countenance and of the shape. Another garment would scarcely prevent our being recognized by

a friend, with whom we had been any time walking and talking. I believe, therefore, that the countenance was, in point of fact, supernaturally changed and appeared to the disciples in another point of view.

13. "*The residue.*"] This does not relate exclusively to the apostles, to whom these two did not belong, but to the remaining disciples. This I collect from Luke xxiv. 33, where it says, that immediately upon this return, and after having brought the first intelligence of what they had seen, they met the apostles with other disciples, and related the story "to the eleven gathered together, and to them that were with them."

"*Neither believed they them.*"] A contradiction has been here said to exist betwixt this history and Luke xxiv. 34. I find none, although I confess I am not very partial to this appendix to Mark, and think, according to the reading in Luke, that many of those who were present did not believe. But more of this hereafter, when I shall come to Luke. It is astonishing what pains have been taken by commentators to reconcile the contradiction between the two evangelists; their words have been twisted in every way. Some

have said that the disciples believed in the resurrection of Jesus, and in his appearance to Peter, but that the two disciples going to Emmaus did not believe. If a man believes what is next to incredible, that Jesus is risen from the dead, and that Peter has seen him, will he be disposed to be incredulous, because two others maintain they have seen him also?

LUKE XXIV. 13—35.

13. "*And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs.*

14. "*And they talked together of all these things which had happened.*

15. "*And it came to pass, that while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them.*

16. "*But their eyes were holden, that they should not know him.*

17. "*And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad?*

18. "*And then one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering, said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?*

19. " *And he said unto them what things? And they said unto him, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet, mighty in deed and word before God, and all the people;*

20. " *And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and crucified him.*

21. " *But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel; and besides all this, to day is the third day since these things were done.*

22. " *Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;*

23. " *And when they found not his body, they came saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive.*

24. " *And certain of them which were with us, went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said, but him they saw not.*

25. " *Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken,*

26. " *Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?*

27. " *And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.*

28. " *And they drew nigh unto the village*

whither they went; and he made as though he would have gone farther.

29. "*But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent, and he went in to tarry with them.*"

30. "*And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them.*

31. "*And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.*

32. "*And they said one to another, Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?*

33. "*And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.*

34. "*Saying, the Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.*

35. "*And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known to them in breaking of bread.*"

13. "*Two of them.*"] It appears to us tolerably clear, that these two were disciples, and not apostles. If they were apostles how does this coincide with verse 33, "they returned to

Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together?" We know, from Luke's own narration, one of these disciples to have been Cleopas, or rather Clopas; but of the other we know nothing, and therefore may well dispense with the trouble of guessing him. All who conjecture here must err, for in history we must not conjecture, we must reason from evidence; but those err most who have conjectured him to be an apostle; Nicodemus, Peter, or any other person. He who wishes to know the history of these conjectures, and at the same time the refutation of the many errors that have arisen from them, should read the Gottingen Programme for Easter 1754, written by the Counsellor of the Consistory, Walck. Only one of these errors, but in point of fact, the most singular, one the most adopted, and therefore of such importance in the explanation of the gospel, will be here quoted; "That Peter was one of the disciples travelling to Emmaus." An error it certainly is, arising from the anxiety of those who undertake the gratuitous task of reconciling Mark xvi. 13, with Luke xxiv. 34. It were better at once to give up the disputed verses in this chapter of Mark, than to adopt

improbable theories, which only create a sneer in the enemies, and deep regret in the sincere friends of Christianity.

1. Peter is one of the apostles, and cannot, for the reason above mentioned, be one of the disciples travelling to Emmaus; and

2. If Peter, in the 12th, or immediately preceding verse, is described as having ran to the sepulchre; as having found it empty, and being struck with astonishment; and if in the next, or 13th verse, he is travelling to Emmaus, would not every reasonable writer continue, "And he went with another to Emmaus." Would he recommence so abruptly and formally, "And behold! two of them went that same day to Emmaus."

3. Is it likely that Luke would omit mentioning such a distinguished name as Peter? If the two disciples going to Emmaus were not well known, the historian might with propriety leave out their names, as persons in whom, abstractedly, the reader took no interest; but to suppress the name of Peter, a name so connected with Christianity, would be destroying almost at once the interest of the whole story.

4. If the words of the 34th verse, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon,"

refer to the vision at Emmaus, it is still more inconceivable that Luke should relate these words, without preparing his reader, (and from the necessary connexion with the 12th verse he could easily do so,) and from thence proceed to the statement, that Peter was one of the two disciples.

5. If Peter was present at the sepulchre, and found it empty, the 24th verse runs very strangely: "And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it so as the women had said." If, for instance, it was Cleopas who was speaking, he would have expressed himself to this effect: "One of us" or, "this man here went with another to the grave." If it was Peter who spoke, he would have said, "And I myself, together with another, was at the grave." If the eye-witness of this extraordinary history was one of the travellers and narrators, would he omit this circumstance, and say anonymously, "And certain of them which were with us went," &c. &c.? An inquiring mind, therefore, does not profess to know how the other disciple is named; we have only the name of Cleopas, we must, therefore, state our ignorance, and leave the superiority to others. Nevertheless, the opinion that Peter was one of

the disciples, is by no means a new opinion. The Cambridge has the reading of the 34th verse (λέγοντες) in such a manner as that it would appear the disciples who returned from Emmaus said, "the Lord was risen indeed," and not, as is the usual interpretation, "the eleven apostles, and those who were with them."

"*Emmaus.*"] There are two places of this name, the one about 60, and the other probably more than 160 stadia from Jerusalem.

1. A town of some repute, which received subsequently the name of Nicopolis, and frequently occurs in history. It is 22 Roman miles, or 176 stadia, from Jerusalem, (Reland, b. 309, 427,): 600 stadia, or 75 Roman miles, make one degree, consequently eight stadia make a mile. I wish to observe here, that the 176 stadia may, without impropriety, be reduced to 160. For, partly, there are between towns nearer ways; and partly, because the Roman miles were accurately enough taken for the earth, but not for the heavens, of which when they established their miles, the Romans had no just idea. Even the round number of 1000 paces which they reckoned to a mile, and from which it received its name, shows immediately, to an arithmetician, that it could not

be exactly the 75th part of a degree, but was either more or less.

2. A place of the same name existed 60 stadia from Jerusalem, which Titus Vespasianus, according to Josephus, (Jewish Wars, b. vii. c. 6, s. 6,) gave to 800 veteran soldiers.

Which of the two is here intended? That Luke should say "sixty furlongs" does not here decide the question, for there is another and important various reading, namely, "one hundred and sixty furlongs or stadia." So it stands, not only in the manuscripts cited by Wetstein, but in a Romish copy of a New-Syriac translation in the margin, and in another copy in the text. The Cyprian manuscript, a very old fragment of Luke, in Vienna, and a manuscript from Mount Athos, of the eleventh century, both concur in 160 stadia or furlongs. The latter, especially, says in the margin, that 160 is the true reading, and in conformity with the best manuscripts. The possibility of performing 60 or 160 stadia in one day is not decisive; although it is much easier to go to Emmaus, lying only 60 furlongs from Jerusalem, and to return the same evening, but with even 160 it is not impossible. Forty furlongs make a true mathematical German mile, of which 15

make a degree; and he who makes 32 stadia to a German mile, has brought his error from a bad school. According to the old geographers 600 stadia make a degree, and therefore 40 stadia make a German mile; a good walker will go four German miles of 15 to a degree, in six hours. If therefore the two disciples quitted Jerusalem early, they could, by the decline of day, be at Nicopolis about three o'clock, and if they returned at four, be at Jerusalem again at ten; to many this may appear inconceivable, but this is owing to their ignorance or to the variety of German miles. In Westphalia and in Hanover, where the miles are longer, this would not apply. But 15 miles go to a degree, and 40 furlongs, or five English miles make a correct German mile. Distance, therefore, is no decision: but there is another mode of arriving at it, which is not only satisfactory, but has considerable influence upon our history. Emmaus, which lay 160 furlongs from Jerusalem, is described sometimes as a city, sometimes as a fortification, sometimes as the chief town in the district, whose name it bears; but in Luke our Emmaus is described as a village, and in Mark the disciples are stated as having gone "into the country." The description,

therefore, applies to Emmaus, which is 60 furlongs from Jerusalem, and Josephus says is a mere village. Sixty furlongs are equal to one and a half German, or seven and a half English miles, and this may easily be performed in two hours and a half. If, therefore, this is the true Emmaus, they need not have quitted Jerusalem before one or two o'clock, as they arrived at Emmaus towards the close of the day. It would seem as if they had wished to withdraw themselves from the agitation of a great city, and coolly talk over what they had heard under such doubtful and extraordinary reports. What has been generally said, that they wished to go into Galilee, does not coincide with the expression of this evangelist, "That they were going to the village of Emmaus, lying sixty furlongs from Jerusalem," and "that they were going into the country." The common road to Galilee was not by Emmaus, but rather on the opposite side towards Jericho; or, if this should be supposed too much to the eastward, by Sechem, (John iv.) I believe their object to have been to stay at Emmaus, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, until they heard something more decisive with regard to Jesus, either that he was really risen, or that the report was false, and

that the body had been carried to some other place.

15. I understand this to mean that Jesus walked behind them, came up with them at a rapid step, heard their conversation, and then spoke to them as he overtook them.

16. "*But their eyes were holden.*"] This has been thus explained. As they had a long conversation with Jesus without knowing him, it could not be, as some have said, the mere inattention of the disciples, and the change of clothes, which caused their forgetfulness or their ignorance: I consider it to have been a supernatural cause which prevented their recognizing the usual features of Jesus: they saw him, as Mark says, "in another form."

18. "*Cleopas.*"] A question here has arisen which has a greater influence on the essential part of the history, than one would at first imagine; namely, whether this is the same person who in John xix. 25, is called Clopas? (in our English translation Cleophas.) If so, he is a very important personage, for it has been shown that Cleophas or Clopas and Alpheus are the same, and that he was the husband of the same Salome, who found the grave of Jesus empty, and was, consequently, on his wife's side, a rela-

tion of Jesus. But this will not benefit us here, Clopas and Cleopas are undoubtedly distinct names, and more so in Greek than with us; independently however of the one having an *e*, and of the *o* in the one being short, in the other long, and of the Greek origin of the one name, and of the Oriental origin of the other, I was at one time induced to think there might have been a mistake in the transcripts of the manuscripts, arising partly from the habits of the ancient Greek writers, partly from the erasure of a letter. But this opinion I have abandoned, and I consider this Cleopas to be a distinct person from the one mentioned in John. My reasons are—

1. No one single manuscript confirms my first supposition, of Clopas being the right reading in Luke. Some have Cleophas with a long sounding *o*, but this is again another various reading, and an almost evident error from the mixture of two various readings.

2. If Luke spoke of Cleophas or Alphæus, he would have given him the latter name, as in Luke vi. 15, and in Acts i. 13, and not have given him a name which occurs for the first time in John, and subsequently, of course, to the time of Luke's writing.

3. It is singular, if Alphæus speaks, he should not say one word of his own wife having been at the sepulchre, and having found it empty. I understand, therefore, by this passage, a disciple of Jesus, known to us only under his Greek name of Cleopas.

" Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem?"] He sees the unknown pilgrim as a stranger who was come to Jerusalem to attend the passover.

19. *" Mighty in deed and word."*] The one refers to his miracles, the other to his energetic and penetrating exhortations. There is a similar expression of Moses (Acts vii. 22,) but the word " deeds" there, are deeds performed by great human exertions.

" Before God."] Namely a prophet, who served God. It is the same as in Hebrew, standing and walking before God. He served God as a prophet, and was recognized as a prophet by all the people.

21. *" But we trusted that it should have been he which should have redeemed Israel."*] A melancholy expression, for it appears as if their whole hope vanished with it. As the disciples in general expected a temporal kingdom from the Messiah, and a deliverance from the Roman yoke, we can consider the expression in the

mouth of Cleopas, " the Redemption of Israel," as leading only to this feeling. A very singular various reading occurs in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, which deserves some inquiry, viz. " we hope he will redeem Israel;" that is, we do not cease hoping, and for that reason we are conversing with one another, whether the intelligence of the resurrection is true, and whether there are yet any hopes. The subsequent reproach of tardiness of belief is not at all inconsistent with this explanation, for they still doubt. But it is too uncertain to take a reading, which so much alters the sense, upon the credit of a single manuscript. It deserves more investigation, and a more copious collation of other manuscripts.

" *To day is the third day.*"] Cleopas must have said something to the stranger why the third day was so remarkable, but which Luke omits as obvious to his readers.

23. Luke was not aware that some women at least (Mary Magdalene to a certainty) had seen Jesus, and therefore Cleopas does not mention it.

24. Here is an evident allusion to John and Peter. It has already been shown that Peter

was not one of the disciples going to Emmaus, as he is not mentioned to have been present and to have been an eye-witness.

25. "*Slow of heart.*"] This mode of speaking may comprehend two things,—slow of perception, or slow of belief. In Hebrew the effect is the same; I prefer the latter meaning.

"*To believe all that the prophets have spoken.*"] That is, "You ought to have known from the prophets, that Christ was to die, and that, before he saw corruption, he was to rise again. (Psalms xvi. 10.) And as the prophets uniformly agree in this, as the prophecy is fulfilled, and as those whom you know, and in whom you have confidence, have told you that Jesus is risen, namely the same Jesus whom you believe to be the Christ, why do you now hesitate to believe?"

27. "*And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets.*"] Every one understands this in but one, and its plain meaning. Jesus, probably, explained only from Moses the sacrifices and the types which related to himself; for though the prophecies relate to him generally, as being of the seed of Abraham, the Shiloh that was to appear, and the great prophet, yet those of Moses say nothing of his sufferings and of his

death, and yet to these last would the explanation chiefly refer.

28. Some have questioned the morality of this ostensible inclination to proceed further, but which, after all, rests upon our confounding two distinct things, namely, the speaking of an untruth, which is unjust, and our silence or suppression of truth, which is neither forbid in morality nor in the bible. This is a question, however, more for casuists.

If Jesus had said, "I shall not remain here to-night, I shall go further," but which Luke has not stated, still it would not have been untrue, for he did not remain all night at Emmaus.

29. Wetstein has explained the passage, "for it is towards evening, and the day is far spent." All this appears to have taken place between three and five o'clock in the afternoon, according to our mode of reckoning. The time is what we should call vespers, and the sun is low in the horizon. Whether they sat down to table immediately on their arrival at Emmaus, or waited for the preparation of their food, cannot be inferred from the silence of the evangelist; in general, the chief meal of the Romans was about three or four o'clock. In southern

countries, it is too hot to eat earlier with any appetite: they breakfasted at nine, and dined at three or four o'clock.

33. If they set off for Jerusalem at five o'clock, they would arrive there about half-past seven; if at six o'clock, they would be there at half-past eight.

"*The eleven gathered together, and them that were with them.*"] The eleven apostles. This does not contradict John xx. 24. A college or an aggregate body is so named, according to its full number, even though a member of it should be deficient or absent at the time. We may perceive in other respects, from Luke, that other disciples were present besides the apostles, and this coincides with Mark xvi. 12. John, indeed, does not specify this, but he does not contradict it, for he does not afterwards say "the eleven or the twelve," but without reference to any number, "the disciples;" which name comprehends not only the apostles, but also the other disciples of Jesus. In general it is the custom of John to omit what has been stated by the other evangelists, and to assume as known to others what is already described in them.

34. It has been said a contradiction exists between this passage and Mark xvi. 13, because

in Luke the disciples announce to those who had returned from Emmaus, "The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared unto Simon." If the contradiction were real, it would still be insignificant, nor would it be necessary to torture it in so ungracious a manner as many have done; it would be only necessary to say, that the unknown writer of the last eight verses of Mark had erred. But I cannot see the contradiction. Ten apostles, and some other disciples besides them, are together. When, therefore, Luke says, they had informed the disciples returning from Emmaus, that the Lord was risen and had appeared unto Peter, the meaning would not be that they had all given this information successively, but that one amongst them had done it. Some, therefore, (and certainly Peter and John,) believed, but did all those who were present believe? We must be little acquainted with the great difference of opinion prevailing in human minds, if we can, without witnesses, receive that as certain, and even make it out as a contradiction against Mark, that in a case so incredible as the resurrection of a dead man, all, or at all events more than ten, should have believed, and not one have any doubt upon the fact. Besides Peter, no one had seen Jesus

himself; and is it then certain, that they would all rely upon the testimony of Peter, when we afterwards find one of them, Thomas, who did not believe their combined evidence? It was not necessary for them to consider Peter as speaking a wilful falsehood. They might fancy his imagination had been heated, or rather, according to their mode of thinking amongst the Jews, that the shade or spirit of Jesus, an apparition after death, had appeared unto him. (Acts xii. 15.) We see even from Luke himself that many thought so, and still doubted, for when Jesus afterwards appeared amongst them, and showed himself to them, some of them conceived they saw a spirit. Verse 37, Jesus says, "Why do thoughts arise in your hearts?" and he commands them to feel his hands and feet, in order to convince them, that he was not a spirit; v. 38, 39, 40. But they still remained, to a certain degree, unbelieving, v. 41. Luke here uses the same word as Mark. How, therefore, could there be a contradiction between men, who both use the same word in their narration? And then Jesus requires them to give him food, that they may be more fully convinced he was no spirit, no departed shade. To give a specimen of the far-fetched illustration by which many

have endeavoured to reconcile this gratuitous contradiction. They assume that Simon was one of the disciples that went to Emmaus, and they then turn into a matter of doubt what the assembled disciples say: "Is the Lord risen indeed, and has he been seen of Simon?" It has already been shown that Peter could not have been one of the disciples that went to Emmaus, but, independent of this, it is still uncertain whether by Simon is meant Simon Peter, or whether, as some have supposed, he was not another Simon? Luke would be, indeed, a wonderful writer, if, without informing his readers that the name of one of the disciples of Emmaus was Simon, and before the disciples from Emmaus had communicated their report (for they only began at v. 35,) he should make the apostles say, "Has Simon seen the Lord?" He tells us, what nobody particularly wants to know, that Cleopas was one of the disciples, but he does not say one word of what was more important, namely, that the other disciple was named Simon. Luke is certainly not well defended by these advocates. The charge is, that he relates a circumstance erroneously; but this is the liability of every human historian. The defence makes him out a very inefficient writer.

According to these advocates, the eleven should have asked, "Is the Lord really risen, and have you seen him?" And, in fact, if the words are to be converted, *ad libitum*, into doubt, it would be one of astonishment, "Then the Lord is really risen, and Simon has seen him." But admitting that Simon was one of those who came from Emmaus, the Cambridge manuscript, relates it in a much more accommodating manner, and refers the word "saying" in the beginning of the 34th verse, to the two disciples from Emmaus, and not to the eleven apostles, and the disciples who were with them. But in this case it would have been "that the Lord is indeed risen, and hath appeared to us," and Luke, if he wished to be intelligible, would have mentioned Cleopas in conjunction with Simon. But the Cambridge mannscript is, after all, not a perfectly safe guide for a various reading.

"*Has been seen by Simon.*"] I prefer this to the common translation "has appeared unto Simon." My learned readers know this would require another Greek word,* and "appeared" in this sense would tend to justify the notion of apparitions, but which it is the writer's ob-

* In the original ωφθη; "appeared," would be "εφανη."

ject to avoid; and the word in the original being rendered, "being seen by him" leads to the conclusion of his being actually risen, and does away the supposition of a departed spirit re-appearing after death.

X. JESUS SHOWS HIMSELF ALIVE TO THE TEN APOSTLES, AND TO SOME OTHER DISCIPLES, WHO WERE WITH THEM.

(JOHN XX. 24. LUKE XXIV. 33.)

LUKE XXIV. 36—49. JOHN XX. 19—23.
MARK XVI. 14—18.

Luke xxiv. 36. *"And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*

37. *"But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.*

38. *"And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts?*

39. *"Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.*

40. *"And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet.*

41. *" And while they yet believed not for joy and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat?*

42. *" And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey comb.*

43. *" And he took it, and did eat before them.*

44. *" And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.*

45. *" Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures,*

46. *" And said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day;*

47. *" And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, amongst all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.*

48. *" And ye are witnesses of these things.*

49. *" And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."*

37. *" They supposed they had seen a spirit."*] The doctrine of spirits, according to which the shades of the dead (especially of those who

had no tomb) were to appear, was at that time very prevalent in the world, and we have only to read the 27th letter of the 7th book of Pliny, to see how seriously men of sense were affected by a question which now would only excite a smile. The Jews were particularly infected with this notion; it reigned far and wide in the east, and was subsequently introduced by the Arabs, who are great believers in spirits, into Europe. Some of the disciples believed Jesus to have been merely a spirit; and that, although having every character of humanity, he was a departed apparition. Thus in Acts xii. 15, they believe Peter to have been represented by his angel. That the disciples of Jesus were infected with the common error of their time and country, is not to be wondered at; but the New Testament, and indeed it may be said of the Bible generally, is free from this error, and gives us no inducement to believe in spirits. When the disciples fancy they see a ghost, it is in fact no ghost; and it is this experience, and not reasoning from probabilities, which induces a belief that there are no ghosts; for all these stories are either founded upon mere imagination, or terminate in the eventual discovery of flesh and blood. It is most honourable to the

Bible, that this rational error, from which some of these writers were not free, is not an error of the Bible; but that this book should be not only superior to all rational knowledge, but even to the knowledge of its own human composers.

38. "*Why do thoughts arise?*"] The same reading is in the Chaldaic of Daniel, ii. 29; and it is not improbable, that Christ, who commonly spake Chaldaic, may have used the same words.

39. If the text here speaks perfect truth, it is impossible that Christ, at the time of showing himself to his disciples, could have had a spiritual body, so as to penetrate closed doors, such as has been assumed from John xx. 19. If a body is composed of flesh and blood, and if the hand resists the touch, both the door and himself must have met with mutual resistance; he could not have come, as we say in Europe, through the key-hole.

41. "*And whilst they yet believed not for joy.*"] If any thing unexpectedly fortunate happens to a man, he does not immediately believe it. He considers it imaginary, and the mere delusion of hope. It was thus with the disciples; they knew not whether they were deceived by their hopes, or whether they be-

held a spirit. In short, they did not believe that Jesus was risen; and this is stated in the appendix to Mark. Is there then between this appendix to Mark (for which I am no advocate, and am prepared to abandon its authenticity) and between Luke any contradiction? Do they not both say the same thing? To me it is inconceivable that the friends and the enemies of religion should have two opinions upon the subject.

44. We ought here to be acquainted with the Jewish division of the Old Testament, not merely to understand this verse, but the theological applications, which we deduce from it. They are as follows; and consist of three parts.

1. "The Books of Moses." These are expressly mentioned.

2. "The Prophets;" viz. Joshua, the book of Judges, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, (but not Daniel, whom, from a singular cause, the Jews have excluded from the number of prophets since the destruction of Jerusalem,) and the minor prophets.

3. "The Hagiographa," or sacred writings; that is, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Job, Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes,

Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles. It has not been uncommonly held, that the Psalms here mean the whole of the sacred writings, and that, consequently, they are a guarantee of their canonical authority. The latter part of the sentence I admit; and if this were the proper place, I could prove the canonical authority of the Proverbs of Solomon, and of Job, from different passages in the New Testament. But in the sacred writings, I do not include Daniel, who belongs with more justice to the prophets. To this, however, our passage does not apply, and the Psalms collectively can hardly be said to comprehend the sacred writings. The following are my reasons:

1. The division of the Bible into books was different in the time of Christ, from what it is now. But putting this out of the question,

2. It is not shown from any authority, that the Psalms, which are the first book of the "sacred writings," have been used to signify the whole of the "sacred writings;" so that it remains a mere conjecture of commentators.

3. This 44th verse of Luke evidently applies to books which contain predictions of the sufferings and of the resurrection of Christ; and these are not mentioned either in the Proverbs

of Solomon, or Ruth, or the Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, or Nehemiah: consequently these cannot be meant.*

Another, and common division of the Bible, in the time of Christ, was, as we learn from Josephus and Philo,—

1. "The books of Moses."

2. "The Prophets;" under which name are comprehended all the historical books from the time of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the minor prophets.

3. Songs of praise and moral books, four in number,—the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Job.

Professor Horneman believes in this division, that under the word "Psalms," (as the first name that occurs,) the Proverbs, Ecclesi-

* I omit Job and the Song of Solomon, because upon these two last there are different opinions. Justin Martyr, in his Discourse with Tryphon, quotes Ezra; but this I omit, as well as the Chronicles; for although (1 Chron. xvii.) the promise of an eternal kingdom to the house of David is fulfilled in Christ, yet the Chronicles have no allusion to his death and resurrection. In my opinion the Psalms are the only book of the "Sacred Writings," as above classed, which contain any prediction of the death and resurrection of Christ.

astes, and Job are comprehended. I own I cannot agree with him; first, because the opinion rests on no good authority; and secondly, because these three last do not seem to contain any prediction of the Messiah.

"*In the law of Moses.*"] I understand by this specially, the law of sacrifice, which is expressly declared, in the 40th Psalm, to relate to Christ, and to be fufilled in his oblation. Other passages in Moses, relating to Christ,—as for instance, where all nations are to be blessed in the seed of Abraham, and perhaps Genesis xlix. 10, say nothing of his death or resurrection.

45. "*Then opened he their understanding.*"] The meaning is, he explained to them many passages of the Bible, which were not previously understood.

49. "*But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem.*"] The enemies of Christianity have here found the most glaring and irreconcileable contradiction betwixt that which Luke (Acts i. 4.) relates Jesus to have commanded his disciples "not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Holy Ghost," and the thrice repeated commandment (Matt. xxvi. 32; xxviii. 7—10: Mark xiv. 28; xvi. 7.) to go to Galilee,

where Jesus was to show himself to them upon a certain mountain. If this last were, in reality, impossible, it would only remain a contradiction between Luke and the other evangelists; for in the 21st chapter of John we actually find the disciples in Galilee; although he did not think it necessary to repeat the order which prescribes this journey, in consequence of its being contained in the other evangelists; but he assumes it, as already known from Matthew and from Mark; for otherwise it would be incomprehensible, how five apostles and two disciples could be, all at once, upon the Lake of Tiberias. (John xxi. 1, 2.) John, therefore, an eye-witness of every thing, and who had read the other three evangelists, confirms what Matthew and what Mark have written; and then the error would be entirely on the side of Luke, who was himself no eye-witness; and nothing would be lost to us, but the divine inspiration of this last evangelist, for which, as I have before remarked, we have not the same strong arguments, as for that of Matthew and of John. But independent of this, his error, strictly speaking, would be only one of imperfect narration, and would rest on the omission of various details: "That they were not entirely

to quit Jerusalem, but that, according to the commandment given them to go to Galilee, they were afterwards to return to Jerusalem, and remain there until they received the Holy Ghost." Here, in fact, religion loses nothing, and the credibility of a history cannot suffer, if one who has only heard it from others, relates anything so defectively as to be at variance with an eye-witness. I do not see, however, the necessity of giving up Luke so readily. It is clear that he did not know one thing, which the other evangelists, and even Paul knew; but he has said nothing, as far as I can see, to contradict them.

If a person is commanded to remain in a given city, and to expect the performance of a promise to be fulfilled in that city, he is not necessarily confined to the place, or prohibited from going beyond the walls. We find the apostles, both Luke xxiv. 50, and Acts i. 12, quitting Jerusalem, although, strictly speaking, resident in it. It does not appear that they might not have been absent for a few days, although they were under a command not to change their usual place of residence, or, as in the special case of the apostles, who were to publish the gospel to the whole world, although they were not to proceed upon their mission

without further instructions. Supposing a man of influence to promise a place to a young student at an university, and that he enjoined him to remain, or rather not to quit the university before he sent him an order for his appointment, the student would not be prohibited from going out for his amusement, or even from making an excursion of a few days; he is only to make the university his more immediate residence, and to wait for the completion of the promise. If Jesus, therefore, as we know from the three evangelists, had ordered all his disciples to go to Galilee, in order that they might bear testimony to him, then the signification of the present injunction would amount to this: "they were not to leave Jerusalem entirely, and commence the preaching of the gospel in the world, until they should have received the Holy Ghost: that they should return to Jerusalem, after their journey into Galilee, and wait for him there." The only thing which astonishes me, is that Luke should have said nothing of the appearance of Galilee, which rests upon the testimony of the other three evangelists, but entirely omits it. Matthew and Mark both contain the order to go to Galilee, where Jesus declared he would be visible to all his disciples; Matthew

relates the appearance itself, and if Mark does not do so, the probability is, that it arose from his being prevented finishing his gospel. John omits, it is true, or rather he assumes as known, what is written by the other evangelists, but we actually find in his twenty-first chapter, the disciples assembled with Jesus at the lake of Tiberias. The silence and ignorance of Luke upon this subject are the more extraordinary, as even Paul, whose travelling companion he so long was, certainly alludes to this appearance, 1 Corinth. xv. 6, an appearance the most convincing, because more than five hundred brethren saw the Lord. We can scarcely account for his silence, except by supposing Luke to have written his gospel before he became the travelling companion of Paul, (or at least, that he did not write by the dictation of Paul,) and, having found no mention made of this appearance in the existing biography of Jesus, of the truth or inaccuracy of which he could only satisfy himself through the medium of others, not to have inquired about, and consequently to have omitted it. If any one can give a better explanation of this extraordinary omission, it will give me great pleasure.

JOHN XX. 19—23.

19. *" Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*

20. *" And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.*

21. *" Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you, as my Father has sent me, even so send I you.*

22. *" And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*

23. *" Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained."*

19. *" Then the same day at evening."*] It has surprised many readers, that John should reckon the evening which followed the Sunday, into the Sunday, or the same day, on which Jesus rose from the dead, when, with the Jews, the day ceased on the setting of the sun. But in the first place, we must remember that

John writes at Ephesus, and therefore may fairly be presumed to follow the Greek mode of calculation, in order to be more generally understood; and in the second place, even amongst the Hebrews, the succeeding evening is reckoned as belonging to the one immediately preceding, whenever it relates to supper or to feasts, precisely because the supper naturally belongs to the preceding day: thus, for instance, in the law of the Paschal Lamb, Exodus xii. 6, 8, 18; in the laws respecting the eating of the Peace Offerings, Leviticus vii. 15; and upon Fast Days, Leviticus xxiii. 32.

"*When the doors were shut for fear of the Jews.*"] It has been a source of conjecture with some, why there should be here more than one door. We know from our common experience that most rooms have two, if not more doors. But, according to the Hebrew method of building, there was generally a separate room in the upper part, and to which the Acts of the Apostles i. 13, refer. This room, which was called *alija*, had at least two doors, one towards the house, which was generally kept shut, the second looking towards a private staircase, which was separated from the house and went directly to the street, where was another door;

therefore the alija, when perfectly shut, had four doors, the two towards the house and towards the private staircase, the street door of the house, and the street door of the private staircase. This explanation is unnecessary to readers who believe a room may have commonly more doors than one. The meaning is not, that Christ entered the room through doors that were positively closed, or through the fine imperceivable interstices of the wood, although subsequent to the resurrection he had a spiritual, or as others will have it, an ethereal body; for he himself declares, Luke xxiv. 39, that his body is composed of flesh and bone, and commands his disciples to ascertain the fact, by touching him. According to John xx. 27, he had eight days afterwards a completely visible body, and he calls upon Thomas to touch and to examine him. The ridiculous power which some have ascribed to Christ, of his passing through the invisible interstices of the doors, is contrary to Christ's own words, and would make him out a wilful deceiver; so great is the absurdity of overstrained interpretations. It is still more ridiculous, when others assume it as an argument in favour of the omnipresence of the body of Christ, and suppose

him to have been already in the room, and that no doors presented an obstacle to his entrance. They forget that John says, " he came," and that, according to their own doctrine, which they may not have rightly understood, the omnipresence of the person of Christ begins with the ascension, and this took place thirty-nine days before the ascension. Besides, a body that is every where present, cannot be visible to the eyes, or palpable to the touch. It is melancholy that the Bible should be subjected to such illustrations! The case itself is nothing more than this: the doors, which were shut, were opened by Jesus without noise, I admit miraculously; he enters the room unperceived and unseen; (but this is no miracle, for the minds of the disciples were too much occupied to attend to more than one subject;) he stands before them unperceived, and when he is in the midst of them he addresses them, " Peace be with you." I consider the opening of the closed doors to be a miracle, and his entering the room unperceived, and standing in the midst of them may be a miracle also, but it does not a require a miracle to explain it. About ten years ago (1773) there was a case something like this in our university of Gottingen, and in large cities it

must be frequent. A party of young men had assembled to play at hazard, which was strictly forbidden, in a room that was closely locked. But it was contiguous to another room belonging to a member connected with the gamblers, and who was at that time in it; through this room the beadle of the university quietly stole, commanded the gentleman to be silent, and stood and looked over the gamblers for some time, until one of them, suddenly seeing him, immediately announced his alarm.

"*Where the disciples were assembled.*"] John does not say, as Luke expressly does, that other disciples were present, besides the apostles; nor is it necessary, for the word "disciples" comprehends both.

20, 21. "*Peace be unto you.*"] The common salutation and farewell of Hebrews and of Arabians. Jesus takes his leave of them, a second time, with these words; John omits here much of what is said by Luke, assuming it as known, in conformity with his method of narration.

22. "*He breathed on them.*"] An emblematical action, which Jesus immediately explains. His spirit, his inspiration, are to be imparted to them. In this, I look forward to the effusion

of the Holy Ghost, which took place at Pentecost, and I consider the words, " Receive ye the Holy Ghost," as promissory and prophetic. Others have supposed that God increased at the time the gifts of the Holy Spirit to the disciples, and that there were three degrees of this inspiration :

1. When Jesus sent them out during his mission, and gave them power to work certain miracles.

2. When he breathes upon them here, and says, " Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

3. On the day of Pentecost.

But I cannot see in what this augmentation of these gifts at this time consisted. The apostles retained as late as the ascension of Jesus, their former errors with respect to his kingdom; they did not perform any miracles during this period, and were not to go forth to preach the gospel before the effusion of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost; nay, they did not even preach the gospel during this time at Jerusalem.

23. That the power here imparted by Jesus to his disciples, or rather to his apostles, does not extend to our preachers, who are neither successors of the apostles in their office, nor are

in possession of the promised gifts of the Holy Ghost will, I think, be easily admitted. But what is to be understood of "forgiving and retaining sins," if this power was entirely given to the apostles, appears liable to some doubt. I am not looking here to an actual remission of sins before the tribunal of God, or to the infallible assurance that the sins of a particular individual will be forgiven in the world to come. To a power so imparted must be added the powers of knowing the hearts of men: but the apostles never professed to possess this last power, and they did not discriminate Simon the Magician from the other Christians, until he discovered his sentiments by his conduct. Nor do I find that the apostles were ever asked the question: "Am I in a state of grace, are my sins forgiven?" On the contrary, every one, according to their doctrine, ought to prove his faith by his practice. It appears to me, that by forgiveness of sins is meant as much as in Matthew ix. 5, and James v. 15: viz. "If you remit to a sick person the punishment of those sins, which punishment has been sent by God, it shall be remitted, and his health shall be restored; you shall also, upon extraordinary occasions, have the power of inflicting sickness as a

punishment of sin." The Acts xiii. 8—12, and the 1 Cor. v. 3—5, 1 Tim. i. 20, are proofs of this power in the apostles, and that they did actually inflict this miraculous punishment. To these we must add, the several threats of Paul to the Corinthians, in the last chapter of the second epistle, to use the power which had been given him by the Lord. This coincides with what Christ says, Mark xvi. 17, 18, with only this difference, that the gifts and miraculous powers of the apostles are, in the last, numerically augmented. I do not however give this explanation with any degree of confidence, since it appears to me that another is possible: "You shall receive the Holy Ghost, in order to preach the gospel of the remission of sins, and to define in an infallible way, that by which alone it can be obtained with certainty," namely, repentance and faith, not the observations of the Levitical law, and the erroneous opinions and deductions of individuals. What Jesus says, therefore, would coincide with Luke xxiv. 47, and Mark xvi. 15, 16. It is not to be denied that the annunciation of the remission of sins may, by a figure of speech, be termed "the forgiveness of sins." Even our preachers formerly used this figure in absolution

at confession, but which has since been omitted, the words introduced were, "upon this confession I announce to you forgiveness of sins," because many understood the figurative words in a real sense, which gave rise to errors and to cavil. But we must not extend to our clergymen what has been said to the apostles, even if the figure of speech were the same. The apostles, as immediate messengers of God, and animated by his spirit, declared the conditions of forgiveness of sins authoritatively and infallibly; this our clergymen cannot do: and although, as has occurred in some parts of Germany, a weak preacher would, in the height of his zeal, retain the sins of those who dance, or do any thing he chooses to consider immoral, nay, would even exclude them from the communion, yet God would not so retain them.

MARK XVI. 14—18.

14. "*Afterwards he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.*

15. "*And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*

16. "*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned.*

17. "*And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues.*

18. "*They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.*"

16. I cannot, on account of the connexion, think otherwise, but that this was the appearance on the day of the resurrection, and not eight days afterwards, when Thomas was present. The writer had just said, that Jesus had appeared to two disciples going to Emmaus; and that the other disciples, to whom they related this appearance, did not believe them. When he goes on,—"Afterwards he appeared unto the eleven," in opposition to the two first. Can that be any other appearance than what Luke has described (xxiv. 35—39,) namely, on the first day? To this we must add, that the discourses of Jesus, (15—18,) not in words, perhaps, (for he may have enjoined the most important commands in distinct and repeated words,) but in point of fact, coincide with what Luke and John relate of the appearance on the

evening of the day of the resurrection, namely, to announce the gospel to all the world, to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins, combined with the promise of supernatural gifts, through the Holy Ghost. Those who conceive that the word, "afterwards," relates to the second appearance, do not consider, that in Mark we read of only one appearance of this kind, and that John, who alone relates two appearances, had not then written; consequently, that "afterwards" can by no means be in Mark, the same as the second day.

"*To the eleven.*"] Contrasted with the two, whom they would not believe; I have nothing to say against this reading; but I should like to ask, Are there no manuscripts, which, by introducing the conjunction "and," would give the literal translation "to them, and to the eleven?" At present we know of none, but it would harmonize admirably with Luke (xxiv. 36.)

"*As they sat at meat.*"] Literally "lying down;" but as this is not a northern custom, we translate it in English, as well as in German, into the habitual one of "sitting." According to Luke, it does not appear they were still at table, but that they had finished their meal;

and the remainder, if any, was taken away; for Jesus could hardly have seen any food upon the table, when he asks, (Luke xxiv. 41,) "Have you here any meat?" The writer who continued Mark has not entered deeply into detail in his narration; but still this is no contradiction of Luke; for when persons have finished their meals, and remain together in the same position for some time afterwards, we should still say, in the language of conversation, that they were at table.

"*Because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen.*"] Here some manuscripts in the time of Jerome, (that is, in the fourth century,) had an extraordinary appendix, which he has left us in his fourth book, against the pilgrims, p. 520, 4th vol. Benedictine edition. One of the two disputants, whom Jerome introduces, says, "that in some manuscripts, particularly Greek manuscripts, there are the following words:" (which we, however, have not found in any one:) "They excused themselves, and said,—this age is the substance of iniquity and incredulity, which does not, through unclean spirits, permit us to apprehend the real power of God: reveal, therefore, now thy righteousness." The whole ex-

pression differs so much from that which precedes and that which follows it, that no one will be tempted to consider as genuine, a passage, which we find in no manuscript and in no translation, and which is merely in the mouth of a disputant, who feels that his adversary may immediately deny it. I did not wish to omit it, although it is a poor excuse for infidelity, and imposes upon the devil the burden of our sins. It seems, they wanted to make new additions to Mark, independent of that which has always been so considered or suspected.

15. "*Go ye into all the world.*"] A command to go as far as their life permitted, but not intended as a history of the actual extent of the journeys and voyages of the apostles. And yet some have attempted to infer from this passage, that the apostles carried the gospel into America, although it is perfectly manifest their lives were unequal to preach the gospel throughout all the known world.

"*To every creature.*"] Wetstein has shown, from some passages which he has carefully collected, that creature signifies the same as man.

16. "*Baptized.*"] Literally, "is baptized;"

but the Greek fully bears the construction of its being the will and desire of the individual to be baptized. The meaning would seem to be: "He who believes, and shows his belief by his desire to be, and is baptized, the same shall be saved." It will easily be perceived why baptism, in the second part of the verse, does not follow the want of belief; for he who does not believe the gospel, would, of course, not be baptized. Others have alleged, that this guiltless deficiency of baptism did not exclude the individual from salvation. No reasonable man will deny the doctrine, but this is not the place for it.

"*Believeth not.*"] Both Luther and the English version give these words ambiguously. The pure and regular translation from the Greek, does not tend to implicate the person, who, never having heard of the gospel, does not therefore believe in it; but him who, after having heard the preaching of the apostles, accompanied by miracles and visible proofs of divine interposition, remains unbelieving, and consequently subject to the punishment announced by Christ. This passage is not applicable to heathens, who may be now hearing the gospel from missionaries, and yet

do not receive it. The case is not the same. He who heard the preaching of the apostles, accredited by such miracles as Jesus promised them in the 17th and 18th verses of this chapter, had it in his power to examine whether they were true, and to believe. If he disbelieved, it was his own fault. If even now the ablest missionary were to preach to heathens, it might be an easy thing to convince them of the absurdity of idolatry; but it would be much more difficult to convince them of the truth of the Christian religion. The question then would be, whether the books, in which the miracles and prophecies are recorded, and which are produced by the missionary as documents attesting the truth of the religion, are ancient and authentic; and against this the heathen may entertain an innocent suspicion, especially if the missionary previously convinces him that the religious books of the heathen,—as, for instance, the Vedam of the Indians, are neither ancient nor authentic.

17. "*And these signs shall follow them that believe.*"] The apostles not only received the gift of performing miracles, but of communicating certain powers to the faithful by the imposition of hands; and this was, assuredly, the

most irrefragable proof of the divinity of the gospel. See Acts viii. 14—18; xix. 1—7; and 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv.

18. "*Take up serpents.*"] Or, as it is in some manuscripts, "and take up serpents with their hands;" although I do not consider this addition to be genuine. The only instance of such a miracle recorded in the New Testament, is Acts xxviii. 3—6. It has been asserted by some critics, that the words in the common text, and which are in all manuscripts and translations, are not genuine; and that they should be, "and they shall banish all serpents;" although it is not pretended Paul banished all serpents from Malta. But such criticisms cannot affect the authenticity of the received text. I cannot refrain from saying, that these words do not exactly please me; although my objection to them is of another kind, and rests upon this,—that from want of perspicuity, they have not sufficient dignity, and, at the first sight, strike the reader as something inferior. To have serpents in your hands, namely, such as are accustomed to it, or rather whose four poisonous teeth are taken out; or to hold them by the tail, when they cannot turn round their head to seize the hand, is one of the common

mountebank tricks of impostors in Asia and Egypt: it is scarcely credible, that the apostles would imitate this degraded piece of art, to take up serpents in their hands that really had their venomous teeth entire. What happened to Paul, upon whose hand a serpent dashed from the fire, and coiled round him, is totally distinct; it happened only once, and was not so much taking up serpents, as remaining uninjured by them. I would not, however, upon this account, expunge words which are so common in manuscripts and old translations; but rather let my doubts operate upon the whole of this appendix to Mark.

XI. JESUS SHOWS HIMSELF EIGHT DAYS AFTERWARDS TO THE ELEVEN DISCIPLES, AND ESPECIALLY TO THOMAS, WHO WOULD NOT BELIEVE IN HIS RESURRECTION.

JOHN XX. 24—31.

24. *"But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.*

25. *"The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.*

26. *"And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.*

27. *"Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing.*

28. *"And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.*

29. *"Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*

30. "*And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book.*

But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through his name."

A very important history, and highly satisfactory in investigating the truth of the resurrection, that one, at least, who doubted, was present amongst the eleven disciples. Thomas, whose character we learn more accurately from John, than from any other evangelist, seems to have been quite the reverse of credulous, and by no means formed for a belief in miracles. The disciples had already witnessed the resurrection of the dead, in the case of Lazarus, and when Jesus, in speaking of him, as one that he held dear, says that he is going to wake him out of sleep, the idea of a resurrection never occurred to Thomas; but he expresses himself, as if they were all in danger, by going to Lazarus, and that they would die if they went into Judæa. When, on the other hand, Jesus had predicted with sufficient clearness, his approaching death, preparatory to his going to the Father, and had added: "And whither I go,

ye know, and the way ye know;" Thomas replies: "We know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" John xiv. 1—5. In our history, his doubts go as far as they well can. He will not trust the testimony of ten people, whose integrity he has long known, nay, not even his own sight. He conceives, he may either be deceived, or that he may deceive himself. Sight and hearing are not sufficient. He must call to his aid the third sense of feeling, and examine with minuteness, before he ventures to believe. We may be almost tempted to enquire, why the other evangelists have omitted such a remarkable history? The question does not affect Matthew and Mark; for Matthew had not related the first appearance of Jesus, to which this refers, and Mark had not completed his gospel: it affects Luke only, and the answer is ready. Luke did not insert it, because he had not heard it. But John introduces it, according to his custom, because no other evangelist mentions it.

24. "*Called Didymus.*"] This would, in our language, be a very unnecessary observation; but in Greek it is not so. In a book of history we admit all names, although some are not so

easy or so pleasant to retain as others; but the Greek has a species of horror at a barbarous name: hence the frequent translation of names from another tongue into language more congenial with the Greek. They gave their own names to Egyptian cities, although these cities had, at the time, and retained their own name afterwards, in many cases even more pleasing than the Greek one: thus, *On* (the sun) was changed by the Greeks into a long word of five syllables, Heliopolis; and this was the case with almost all the Egyptian cities. John, who wrote at Ephesus, from deference to the Grecian ear, gives both names, as Luke (Acts ix. 36) translates Tabitha, which of the two I think sounds the best, into Dorcas.

27. "*And behold.*"] Take, as you have desired, both fingers to your assistance; feel whether there is any cavity; see with your eyes whether there are any marks of nails.

28. "*My Lord and my God.*"] This has generally been considered an exclamation, and the words seem to admit it; but to me the sense appears to be, "Yes! he is truly my Lord and my God." The exclamation is a recognition of Jesus. I will not go so far as to conclude from these words, that he actually

recognized, at the time, the divine nature of Christ, of which we have no trace amongst the apostles, previous to the effusion of the Holy Ghost; at least it was not the common doctrine of the Jewish theology. But he rather names him in a figurative sense, as one risen from the dead—"His God," whom he will always honour and adore in the same way: as Virgil, in his first eclogue, only still stronger, addresses Augustus—"For he shall always be my God; the tender lamb from our folds shall often stain his altar."

Others have been inclined to consider it as a mere expression of surprise, just as we say, in many modern languages, "My God;" "Good God." The first person who broached this opinion was Theodorus of Mopsuestia, a learned and a clever man; and he was anathematized for it. Wetstein relates the passage. He did not deserve the anathema; but I do not consider his illustration as correct, for it is not borne out by the custom of the Greek or the Hebrew language. "My Lord" is certainly not an exclamation of surprise, but the name by which his disciples addressed Jesus. Even the Socinian Schlichting has rejected the illus-

tration of Theodorus, and observes, that Thomas in using it addresses himself to Jesus.

29. "*Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*"] The belief which arises from the direct evidence of our senses, cannot fail of being complete, and is certainly true belief. But it is not, for that reason, worthy of reward. All cannot see, unless God multiplied miracles to infinity, and those who do not see, should believe the authentic and approved testimony of others. But this faith, which arises from careful examination and cool reflection, is the result of labour and anxiety, and is on that account noble, and worthy of record.

30. "*Signs.*"] This does not signify "signs," by which Jesus was recognized as being actually risen; such as showing the marks of the nails, which would, in fact, be only "testimonies" or "vouchers;" and indeed the expression, "did signs" does not apply to this: it applies to the miracles which Jesus performed, and of which John has quoted the most important in his gospel. As John omits almost all the miracles of Jesus, which we find related in the first three evangelists, such an explanation, at the end of his own gospel, is very appropriate, and shows, that if the reader becomes acquainted

with the other miracles of Jesus, either through the other evangelists, or through other credible and authentic witnesses, the silence of John is not, in this case, to be considered a contradiction. John did not wish to relate all the miracles of Jesus.

"*In the presence of his disciples.*"] Jesus, it is true, did these signs before the world, but John states, that they were performed in the presence of the disciples, and that consequently the disciples themselves saw with their own eyes, the things that were done. It is in reference to this, that John xxi. 24, quotes himself as an eyewitness.

31. John conceives, that the few, but striking miracles which he relates in detail, will be sufficient to convince the reader of the truth, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

XII. Jesus shows himself to five apostles and two disciples in Galilee, at the lake of Tiberias.—Remarkable conversation with Peter and John.—Explanation of an ordinary misrepresentation of what Jesus said.

[*Note.*—John brings forward here a history, which is not to be met with in the other Evangelists, but which is in strict conformity with the object with which he wrote the gospel. There was probably, however, another reason which induced him to write this appendix. In consequence of the words of Jesus, stated by John, and which words have been much misunderstood, a report was current amongst the disciples, that John was not to die, and that he had been promised this by Jesus. This report was more likely to gain credit, as John actually reached a very advanced age, and even after his death this belief was current in the minds of many of the followers of Christ. John knew that he should die, like other men: if he had not, therefore, at an early period, obviated this

feeling, his death, whenever it took place, would have been highly injurious to Christianity; it would have excited the ridicule of Jews and Pagans; it would have rendered Christians wavering, and even seceders from the religion, the founder of which had promised immortality in vain. John could not act more wisely than by an early contradiction of this report, which he does in his own way, first, by detailing the whole history; secondly, by adding that he who was the author of the book in which his name is so often mentioned, was, at the same time, an eye-witness to the truth which it contained.]

JOHN XXI.

1. "*After these things, Jesus showed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias, and in this wise showed he himself.*

2. "*There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, called Didymus, and Nathanael, of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples.*

3. "*Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, we also go with thee. They went forth, and entered into a ship immediately, and that night they caught nothing.*

4. " *But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus.*

5. " *Then saith Jesus unto them, Children, have ye any meat? they answered him, No.*

6. " *And he said unto them, cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes.*

7. " *Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved, saith unto Peter, it is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea.*

8. " *And the other disciples came in a little ship, (for they were not far from land, but as it were two hundred cubits,) dragging the net with fishes.*

9. " *As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread.*

10. " *Jesus saith unto them, bring of the fish which ye have now caught.*

11. " *Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land, full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three, and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken.*

12. " *Jesus saith, Come and dine, and none of*

the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord.

13. " *Jesus then cometh and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise.*

14. " *This is now the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.*

15. " *So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee; He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.*

16. " *He saith unto him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee, He saith unto him, Feed my sheep.*

17. " *He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? and he said unto him, Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.*

18. " *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee, whither thou wouldest not.*

19. "*This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God; and when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, follow me.*

20. "*Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved, following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?*

21. "*Peter, seeing him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do?*

22. "*Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me.*

23. "*Then went this saying abroad amongst the brethren, that that disciple should not die; yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die: but, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?*

24. "*This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true.*

25. "*And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.*"

Hugo Grotius thought that the whole of this chapter was not from the hand of John, but

that the Ephesian bishops had added to it, as coming from the information of the author; in the same way as another hand has added to Deuteronomy, the history of the death and burial of Moses. We must not, however, confound this most improbable supposition with another, which is much older, namely, that the Ephesian elders added the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses, subsequent to the death of John, and declaratory of their opinion of him. I must confess I am in some degree attached to this last supposition, but how the suggestions of Grotius, that the whole chapter is not authentic, could find advocates with critics, to whom one would attribute a sounder judgment, surprises me. We have only to read the entire chapter in Greek, and it becomes at once the distinct, clear, and inimitable style of the evangelist. There is not a line, not a word which seems foreign to it or capable of exciting the least suspicion, and this is saying much in favour of such a style of writing. But there are certain marks, both of fact and language, which betray the apostle, even although we did not find this chapter in his gospel.

1. The very distinct and careful mode of ex-

pression, which shows itself in all the details of action.

2. John has the custom, as Wetstein has happily remarked, of carrying on the verb or noun from one sentence to another; as for instance, chap. xx. 11, "Stood without, weeping, and as she wept." Philologists condemn it, and sometimes with reason, but in John it is in general pleasing. But let us form what judgment we like, this peculiarity occurs several times in this chapter, as I shall observe, verses 1, 17, 20, 21.

3. In some respects there is a deviation from this, as John at times loves to create a variation by means of synonimous words, so that even some ambiguity may arise in the minds of his readers. An instance of this occurs in chap. vii. 34, from the mode in which the Greek word "I am," has been differently accented. Instances of this occur in verses 15, 16, 17.

What Grotius says of Deuteronomy xxxiv. applies rather against his argument, than in favour of it. This thirty-fourth chapter must be considered by every sensible man, as the work of another hand, containing things of which it was not possible that Moses could be conscious, namely, his death and burial. Nothing of this

kind occurs in the chapter of John; I have already said this is an argument against Grotius. If the elders of Ephesus had really added this chapter after the death of John, nothing would have been more natural than to relate his death at verse 23; and indeed nothing would have been more requisite. As we read nothing of his death, the fair conclusion is, that he wrote this chapter whilst he was alive. I shall reserve for another place the objection made to verses 24, 25.

1. "*Jesus showed himself again; and in this wise showed he himself.*"] Repetition of the word "showed" from the preceding sentence.

"*At the sea of Tiberias.*"] The lake of Gennesareth. No evangelist gives the lake this name, so common amongst the Jews, but John, vi. 1. Another remarkable feature by which the style of John may be recognized. But how is it that we meet here the disciples who had previously been at Jerusalem, and find them at once in Galilee, at the lake of Tiberias? I have before observed that John coincides correctly with Matthew and with Mark, according to whom his disciples were ordered to go into Galilee, where they would see him, after he had risen, upon a mountain. Consequently they

go there, and he shows himself unexpectedly at the lake of Gennesareth to the eleven, who are named in the second verse, in addition to the appearance he had already promised. This, however, is not the appearance which he had promised. This last took place upon a mountain, where 500 brethren saw him. (Matth. xxviii. 16—20, 1 Cor. xv. 6.) It does not, however, follow that it was within the scope of his mission, to show himself previously and unexpectedly to some of his disciples. To my mind, this is a decisive answer to some of the perpetual cavils of the enemies of Christianity, namely, that John and Matthew related the appearance in Galilee so differently, the one at the lake, the other on a mountain. No doubt they do, but they speak of two totally distinct appearances. John relates only one of these appearances, as peculiarly applicable to his own situation, but which are omitted by the other evangelists. Again! John does not say one word of the disciples going to Galilee, after having left Jesus with the disciples at Jerusalem, and yet in all other respects he is so accurate a writer, and we find them notwithstanding, assembled all at once in Galilee! This is perfectly in conformity with the custom of John, not to relate what the other

evangelists have related, but only to give the whole a more complete harmony; and it was already known from Matthew and from Mark, that Jesus had ordered his disciples into Galilee in order to show himself to those who were anxious to see him after he was risen.

2. "*Together.*"] By which I understand they lived in one house.

"*Didymus.*"] I beg to refer my reader to the last chapter, verse 24, another trait by which the style of John may be recognized.

"*Nathanael.*"] It has been already observed that this is the apostle whom the other evangelists call Bartholomew, that is, the son of Tholemaus or Ptolemaus; again another sign of the style of John, who alone calls him Nathanael.

"*The sons of Zebedee.*"] James and John.

"*And two other of his disciples.*"] Certainly not apostles, for John would not otherwise have omitted mentioning names already known to his readers.

3. These disciples must have preceded Jesus in point of time, and have been in Galilee, which was their native country, some days before.

4. "*But when the morning was now come.*"] That the Greek word πρωΐ in the original, signifies the time before sunrise, until the first be-

ginning of twilight, it is not necessary for me to repeat. In consequence of the word "now," (ηδη) being introduced, we must understand the time meant, to have been from the very beginning of twilight, as opposed to night. The translation expresses, that day was just beginning to appear. From hence we can understand why the disciples did not immediately recognise Jesus standing at the distance of 350 feet from them, but that afterwards, when it began every minute to be clearer, John knew him.

5. "*Meat.*"] In Greek the same as fishes, as explained by Wetstein and Thomas Magister. I wish to observe with respect to the ninth verse in order to remove the objections which some have expressed, that eight persons should have only one fish, that the Greek word signifies fishes in the plural. But even were it not so, one fish might still satisfy eight people, by allowing half a pound to each, for many fishes weigh above four pounds.

7. It would appear that the recollection of similar circumstances induced John to conjecture it was Jesus, for we find in Luke v. 4—7, that Peter had, at the command of Jesus, hauled a most copious draught; and this recurring to

his mind, he was enabled, by the perpetually increasing daylight, to recognise him.

"*His fisher's coat.*] It would seem, according to the description of Theophylact, and of Niebuhr, in his Travels in Arabia, to be the same fisher's coat which is used by the fishermen in Phœnicia and Syria. The drawing of it in Niebuhr's first volume, (plate 56,) shows how easily it may be girt round the body, and that it creates no hindrance in swimming.

11. "*An hundred and fifty and three.*"] Accurately detailed, according to the manner of John, and not in round numbers. In these 153 fishes, we are not to seek any mystery, much less that which has been fancied by some writers, namely, that they comprehended the different kinds of fish then known; at which a natural historian, who is acquainted with so many more species, would only smile. Besides, this relates only to the lake of Tiberias, and, of course, not to the sea, where there are so many more fishes, as whales for instance. But in John's gospel we find none of these weaknesses; they have been superadded by his modern commentators. One thing only is certain, that the disciples counted the fishes. This extraordinary notion arose from the quickness of

Jerome; this learned man did not write, but dictated as fast as he could, and hence arose several mistakes. In commenting upon the forty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel, he says, "those who have written upon the nature and properties of animals, and, amongst others, Oppianus Celix, a learned poet, state that there are 153 sorts of fishes, all of which were taken by the apostles, and none remained untaken." Evidently he had in his eye this passage of John.

12. "*Dine.*"] The Greek word ἄριστον does not signify properly the dinner, but the breakfast, taken, according to our reckoning, at nine in the morning. The dinner was, as we have observed, Luke xxiv. 29, towards the afternoon; upon this occasion the disciples, who had been at work all night, took their breakfast very early in the morning.

"*None durst ask him.*"] It would have been a very senseless question; as they all knew him, no one permitted himself this freedom.

14. "*The third time.*"] Namely, when Jesus appeared, not to the women, not to individual disciples, but to several disciples collected in one spot.

15, 16, 17.] In the Greek there is here a

change of words, which I cannot render into English, without some difficulty and some obscurity. Thus two words must be translated "love," two others, "feed," two others again, "sheep or even lambs." Some commentators have endeavoured to trace a distinct meaning in this difference of expression, and to show, that to feed, in one sense, signifies "abundance," in another "prudence;" and that to "love," when in the shape of a question, demonstrates superlative, but that when embodied in an answer, it evinces an inferior degree of affection. The probable reason why John changed the words, was to avoid the inconvenience of repetition, and to make those words synonimous, between which no difference could, in common sense, be supposed to exist. Both the Greek and the French language have this in common, that they both dislike repeating the same words, only with this difference, that the French language is obliged to have recourse to circumlocution, whilst the Greek relies upon its copiousness for the insertion of a corresponding signification. It may easily be perceived, that this question, three times repeated, of Jesus, bears a gentle, but sensible allusion to the treble denial of Peter. Jesus does not reproach him with

his failure, but only reminds him here of his superior duty.

15. "*Lovest thou me more than these.*"] The question refers to Matthew xxvi. 33, where Peter, unconscious of his own weakness, exclaims: "Though all men shall be offended, because of thee, yet will I never be offended." Peter, who might be sensible of this, does not answer, "I do love thee more than these," but simply, "thou knowest that I love thee." Le Clerc conceived that Jesus asked Peter, if he loved him more than the other disciples, because he swam out of the ship to meet him. In this case Peter might have cheerfully answered in the affirmative. But Whitby supposes that Jesus asked him, "whether he loved him more than these nets," forgetting Peter had forsaken his net to follow Jesus; and the answer would have been still more inconsistent, for by leaving out the nets, and saying simply, "I love thee," it would imply he loved his nets more.

"*Feed my lambs.*"] Both in Luther's translation and in our own, these words have been so rendered, as if Peter was first to feed the lambs, and then the sheep. The Greek word signifies properly the young males to the end of

the second year, when it then receives another denomination, answering to our word; "rams" and in this confined sense it is used in the Septuagint, Psalms cxiv. 4, 6, and Jeremiah l. 45. The Greek, as both Eustathius and Apollonius have shown from Homer, denotes sheep grown to their full size. Here it is only used as conveying the idea of sheep generally, or it would lead to the inconsistency of Peter feeding one particular species of lambs.

16. Upon the second question, Jesus omits, "more than these," as the silence of Peter had sufficiently declared that he claimed no superiority over the other disciples, but was content to be regarded as their equal.

17. "*Peter was grieved.*"] He felt now too strongly, that Jesus alluded to his former treble denial; and here I must observe, how John repeats the words of the former sentence.

18. The words of Jesus are here susceptible of a different meaning, and may contain a double sense; one of which would immediately strike Peter, and the other be the result of time, and produced by a concurrence of events. The first sense in which he would take it, would be as naturally applying to the infirmities of age. In youth we can dress ourselves, in old age

we require the assistance of others. But the meaning of Jesus, according to the distinct explanation of John was, " he shall stretch out his hands, that they may be bound upon the cross." This happened, partly, when he carried his own cross, for which Wetstein has shown the passages, and partly at the crucifixion itself, for the merely nailing a heavy body to the cross, would have scarcely been sufficient, unless the arms were attached with cords at the same time. The conjectural tone of this prediction is to me no difficulty. It assimilates with the oracular sentences, which were in use amongst the Greeks, and therefore in a style well adapted to prophecy, and to the manner in which all antient nations have represented the Divinity announcing his future destiny to man. The object of prophecy is not always, that the persons whom it affects should understand it, for it is impossible for him to avoid the predicted evil, if in other respects the prophecy is true. Such a prophecy as could be thoroughly understood, and which announced the horrid death of crucifixion in old age, must have tormented a man of any feeling during his whole life, and it would have been nearly the same as crucifying Peter daily for thirty years together. The

real object of prophecy is to show that he, whose predictions are fulfilled, is sent from God; and this end is just as well attained, if he whom it affects, either at, or after his death, becomes fully aware of the truth and completion of the prophecy in his own person.

"*And carry thee, whither thou wouldst not.*"] A pious notion prevailed in the second and third century, that there was something revolting in these words, and that Peter would have embraced his death, and hailed the moment of crucifixion with more than usual satisfaction. But those who entertain these notions, cannot be aware what crucifixion is, when a man lives for at least three days, oppressed with horrible pain, in thirst and fever, and increasing wounds. The bible no where inculcates such morality, and of course not, sound philosophy, with which I always connect common sense; even Jesus himself felt that he suffered, but went to meet his God with resolution and resignation, not, however, without dread and trembling at the formidable hour. The death sought and suffered by martyrs, and said to be so with enthusiastic joy, such as we find it described in works of the second and third centuries, perhaps not with the most accurate his-

torical fidelity, is not profitable to the world, nor does it produce in others a conviction of the truth of religion. This may be deduced from the sincerity itself with which the dying martyr suffers for the infallibility of his own religion. But is the latter therefore true, because an enthusiast believes it? and even if he dies for the truth of what he believes, his enthusiasm takes away much of the strength of his testimony, since we may fairly doubt whether an enthusiast is in full possession of his senses. On the other hand, the martyr who anticipates the pangs of death, and would glady avoid them, but who, from the fear of God and the force of conscience, will rather suffer than abjure his religion; if, like Peter, he has been an eye-witness of the fact, upon which his religion rests, and for which he powerfully dies, is an evidence, not to be contradicted, of the truth of these facts.

19. John who wrote after Peter had been crucified, understood the words of Jesus from their fulfilment.

"*Follow me.*"] This has given rise to argument. Jesus, when he had said this, walked on, as is evident from the twentieth verse, when John follows him. "Follow me," therefore, in

its common signification might be, "come along with me." It was in this sense that Peter understood it, and that he believed Jesus wished to say something to him alone, (v. 20, 21.) It may also mean, "follow me, in the mode of my death." It was thus that Christ used it, as may be seen from his answer in the twenty-second verse. He had already predicted it to Peter, (John xiii. 36, 37.) That Peter should not understand this rightly, when he saw Jesus walking on, is not a matter of surprise; but that learned, and, in fact, very happy commentators should, long after the fulfilment, hesitate about its meaning, and produce the most extraordinary explanation, seems inconceivable; as for instance, "follow me," is to be understood as appointing Peter the successor of Christ, and delivering into his hands the command over the whole world. Peter did not feel himself justified in taking this extreme responsibility, but inquired what was to become of John, and whether he was to have any share in this delegated power? "No," says Jesus, "he is to remain in Galilee, and there preach the gospel until I come;" that John consequently remained in Galilee, until the breaking out of the Jewish war, when finding himself insecure, he fled to

Ephesus. It will naturally be asked what zealous Roman Catholic so early preached this appropriate doctrine? On the contrary, it was a Greek prelate, a man of singular merit and learning, and from whose writings I have drawn much—Theophylact.

21. "*Seeing him.*"] Again a repetition of John, so peculiar to himself, by borrowing from the preceding sentence; only in this case the original word is different, but the meaning is similar.

"*And what shall this man do?*"] It is by no means improbable that Peter believed Jesus wished to speak to him privately, especially in relation to his former denial of him; and he therefore was desirous that no witnesses should be present to the reproach which he was conscious he deserved. His question, therefore, would run thus: "But why should John be here? I conceived you wished to speak with me alone, and that for this reason you separated yourself from the others.

22. Jesus takes the question of Peter in a very different light, supposing the words "follow me" to mean, "follow me in the manner of my death." He answered, therefore: "With respect to this person, give yourself no trouble;

you shall follow me in the manner of your death, but this man shall not. If it is my pleasure that he should attain a great age, and live to see my coming, how does that affect you? Do you make up your mind and follow me."

"*Until I come.*"] This contemplates the future event, so frequently mentioned by the other evangelists,—the destruction of Jerusalem. In John's gospel the expression has not previously occurred; he omits the prophecies relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, as already detailed in the preceding gospels, and assumes them therefore as already known. The contrast which Jesus draws between Peter and John, shows at once, that Peter was not to survive the destruction of Jerusalem. As this, according to Matthew, (xxiv. 34,) would take place before the end of the existing generation; that is to say, thirty-three or twenty-seven years; we can understand why Peter, when he wrote his second epistle, thirty-four years afterwards, should regard the death, announced to him by Christ, as not very remote. 2 Peter i. 14.

23. Others have understood the words, "until I come," to apply to the day of judgment; and believed therefore that John would never

die. John contradicts this erroneous statement himself, in his own life-time. It is astonishing, notwithstanding, it should have prevailed during so many centuries. Theophylact writes, "that Christ says, if I will that he should remain till the end of the world, and then testify of me:" and he adds, "Some say, besides, that John is still alive, but that he will be slain by antichrist, when he preaches Christ with Elias. His tomb indeed is shown; but of what importance is that? He has retired from the world in a living state, and will be hereafter transferred into the existence of Moses and Elias." I can scarcely credit my own eyes when I read this, and what follows, from so venerable a person.

24. "*And we know.*"] Or as we should say, in a detailed manner, "I hope all are aware, that it is an admitted fact amongst us, that the testimony of this disciple is to be credited." This plural has appeared very strange to some old writers, who have gone so far as to consider the two last verses, not as the authentic composition of John, but as the appendix of some elders of Ephesus: and Grotius even concludes, that the whole chapter was not written by John. The last supposition would lead to great

inconsistency, and is evidently the effect of exaggeration. But I cannot even admit this hypothesis of the elders; and I am surprised it never struck him how much this testimony would be out of place. He who will lend his testimony to the truth of what another, and that an eye-witness, has written, should not forget to say who he himself is, and to subscribe his name. What could the elders of Ephesus, who were not eye-witnesses, do more ridiculous than—without the subscription of their name, without our even knowing who it is that testifies—to write, at the end of an apostle's and an eye-witness's gospel, "We know, that his testimony is true." Others again break the original Greek word οιδαμεν in two, οιδα μεν, and translate it, "I know." Others again consider the pronoun "we" as arising from the modesty of John. The first is the emendation of Polycarp Leyser; but this is directly contrary to the style of John, who never uses the first person in the whole gospel, and whose ear must have been accustomed to the Greek prejudices against using "I" generally. The second is done by Theophylact, and appears to me the best. But neither of these explanations are happy; because it immediately follows in the third person, "that

his testimony is true." If John had been inclined to say what they make him say, he would have written: "And he knows, that his testimony is true." This reading, which would be more appropriate, is not, however, to be found in any manuscript or old translation; it remains therefore a subject of fair critical conjecture, principally on account of the parallel passage, John xix. 35, where he speaks in a similar manner of himself.

25. Another ground for rejecting these last verses of John is that the subject of them is only a repetition of John xx. 30. But a writer can repeat at different opportunities, what he knows and feels to be important; and none could be more so than the assertion of miracles, an assertion which, if not made, might be almost construed into doubt; and hence he would naturally argue that his silence is no contradiction to what others before him have stated, either in writing, or by word of mouth.

"*I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books which should be written.*"] An hyperbole much in the same way as Virgil, in the 6th Æneid, v. 625—627,—"that if I had an hundred tongues, and an hundred mouths, and an iron voice, capable of comprehending

every species of crime, I could not describe the names of all the punishments;"—with this difference, that this hyperbole, only carried to a still greater extreme, is common amongst the Jews in their colloquial writings. Wetstein has shown several instances of it. Thus, "if all the seas were ink, all the plants writing-reeds, and every man a writer, I should be unable to write down," &c. &c. This is the extended and far-fetched hyperbole, which gives such offence; but in the gospel it is far from revolting, and only requires that we should not look at it though a microscope. One, however, who is imbued with Grecian taste, would rather attribute it to John, who was born a Hebrew, than to the elders of the Grecian city of Ephesus. Even the passage of Homer, imitated by Virgil, is much more modest; for Homer only supposes ten, and Virgil one hundred tongues: "Not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths." Homer's Iliad, b. 2, v. 489. I think there has been unnecessary labour to endeavour to soften this hyperbole. Wetstein is desirous of explaining it, as not only comprising what Christ himself has done, but what his disciples have also effected, through the prevailing power of grace. But this would still remain hyper-

bole, for the most complete history of the church, comprising the pious effusions of every holy individual, would still find a place in the world. Others wish to translate it, "the world would not receive or believe;" but they would do better if they were to say, "the world would not be able to read;" although this signification would not do, on account of the word "itself," which is connected with it.

"*Amen.*"] An addition, which the transcribers of many Biblical manuscripts make in conformity with the more modern custom of the church; but which old and important manuscripts always omit. It occurs here, as may be seen from Wetstein's various readings, and I consider it as decidedly spurious. If, however, it is still held to be genuine, it can be considered as an additional assurance in favour of the testimony of John.

XIII. Jesus shows himself in Galilee to his disciples upon the mountain to which he had ordered them to go.

Matthew xxviii. 16—20.

16. *" Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them!*

17. *" And when they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted.*

18. *" And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.*

19. *" Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

20. *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."*

This appearance is not mentioned in any other gospel; but, on the other hand, we find it, with the remarkable circumstance that Jesus had been seen, after his resurrection, by more than five hundred brethren at the same time, in

Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians xv. 6. He does not indeed say, that it was in Galilee; but he can allude to no other appearance; partly on account of the time, with reference to which he speaks; partly because Jesus had appointed all his disciples, who wished to see him after he was risen, to go to Galilee. The silence of Mark and John is here of no importance, for Mark was interrupted in the progress of his gospel, and John omits the history, in conformity with his usual custom, in consequence of its being already mentioned in Matthew; and his silence, therefore, as connected with the remarks in John xxi. 1, is confirmation. The silence of Luke is alone remarkable, and must be explained in this way,—that, as he wrote out of Palestine, he had heard nothing of the history, and not finding it noticed in the earlier gospels, which it was his object to verify, he had not inquired about it amongst those who could have given him information, and of whom so many existed at the time. Matthew, on the contrary, omits other appearances, and hastens to this most important one, evidently with reference to what he has related, xxvi. 32, and xxviii. 7. In the Hebrew gospel of the Nazarenes, there was every species of in-

terpolation; but we are ignorant whether it contained what the other evangelists have related to us.

16. "*The eleven disciples.*"] From the passages which have been already quoted, we may conclude that nothing but positive personal fears would have deterred a disciple of Jesus from going to the mountain, where every one who wished to be convinced of the truth of the resurrection, might be certain of the fact; and this was evidently the reason why a mountain in Galilee should have been selected, as being the country where he had most disciples, and where the faith in him was the most prevalent. But as Paul expressly says, that Jesus was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, it is inconceivable, that Matthew should only have mentioned eleven, and been silent, as to the rest. A writer against Christianity has ingeniously observed, that it was unnecessary for the eleven to see him in Galilee, as they had already seen him in Jerusalem. It is impossible for me to believe that the original text of Matthew is in strict conformity with our present reading. With a few more letters, would it not read, "the eleven and the disciples?" If

the Greek words, as they stand in the translation from the Hebrew, were written acording to the old custom of Greek writing, the omission of an "and" would be a very easy error. It is true, that no known manuscript has this reading, but have they all been diligently examined? I despair, however, of finding the various reading in the Greek; and my feeling is, that the translator must have overlooked the conjunction in the Hebrew original. In either of the languages, the Hebrew or the Chaldee, a very slight omission would produce the text as we at present have it.

"*Into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them.*"] The circumstance of the disciples being directed to a mountain, where they were to see Jesus, is not stated in Matthew xxvi. 32, and xxviii. 7; one thing, however, is certain, that Jesus must have appointed a place in Galilee, where his disciples could see him. Whether he did this at the time indicated in Matthew xxvi. 32, or immediately after his resurrection, when he conversed at Jerusalem, with the eleven disciples, is impossible to ascertain from the silence of Matthew; we might rather be tempted to inquire, whether there was

any other fact recorded in the Hebrew gospel, which the Greek translator might conceive suspicious, and think it necessary to omit? But it is unnecessary to assume this; for many writers are imperfect in their narrations, and leave out facts which are satisfactorily supplied by their own sequel. We can as little determine, from the silence of Matthew, where the mountain was situated; it would be weakness to attempt to conjecture it. Only this we may take for granted, that Jesus wished to show himself, after his resurrection, to all his disciples, and to none but his disciples, or otherwise he would not have selected a place where, as far as we can judge, there were no inhabitants.

17. "*But some doubted.*"] Wetstein and Shultz have both shown the accuracy of the Greek passage, and the fidelity of the general translation. Those who doubted, could not have been of the number of the eleven, who saw and recognised Jesus at Jerusalem, but of the five hundred brethren mentioned by Paul. The objections, therefore, at once vanish which have been raised by some to the history, and by Beza to the reading. He wished to read, "and did not doubt," but this opinion has not

been verified by any manuscript or ancient translation for two hundred years.

18. I am appointed by God to be the general Lord of heaven and of earth; go ye, therefore, forth, and reduce to my authority, by the promulgation of the gospel, the whole earth, as far as your powers extend. It is evident that this only relates to the spiritual kingdom of Christ.

19. "*Go ye therefore.*"] As the word "therefore," has been imperfectly connected with the various readings, which even the best collectors, Bengel and Wetstein, have given us, let me be allowed here to supply the deficiency. I only perceive, in the first instance, from both, that many of the manuscripts quoted by Wetstein leave out "therefore," and that it is not probably to be found in any, except in the Cambridge manuscript.

1. "Therefore" is to be met with in old Latin translations, and these are followed by the Latin fathers of the church, quoted by Bengel. The old Syriac, as well as the Philoxenian translation, and the Arabic translation of Erpenius from the Syriac have "therefore." But the Arabic translation in the Polyglot omits it.

2. Other translations have "now," (νῦν) in-

stead of οὖν " therefore." Wetstein states this reading to occur in the Cambridge manuscript, whilst,

3. Others quote it as containing both readings: " Go ye now therefore." Being at a distance from the place, I cannot here decide; but I incline to the reading of the greater part, and indeed to all the manuscripts, which omit " therefore." At the same time, a reading which is supported by the authority of two very old Latin translations is not lightly to be rejected.

" *Teach all nations.*"] In other words, make all nations my disciples. The name of " disciple," was at the time a common appellation in Palestine, adopted by two religions, in their ground-work essentially distinct. Christians are termed in the Acts of the Apostles, " saints," " those who are of the way," " brethren," and " disciples." Those who held John the Baptist to be the great prophet, in opposition to Jesus, were called " Mendaens," or more properly " Mendai Juchanen," the disciples of John: Christ therefore ordains that they should make disciples of all men, by baptising them, and teaching them his entire doctrine. I will first endeavour to explain this with reference

to our common translation, both in German and English, a translation which has produced such practical difference of opinion in the Christian church, and thus satisfy, I hope, the minds of those who have applied to me for my opinion upon the subject. Jesus lays down two rules of action, by which men were to become his disciples: 1. By baptism. 2. By teaching them to conform to every thing which he had taught them. As the rule here certainly does not apply to little children, but to those to whom the apostles were to preach the gospel, we may, perhaps, be surprised at the arrangement, which places baptism before instruction. This, however, is in strict conformity with the actual conduct of the apostles, and was at the same time, very reasonable. If men were ready, in consequence of the preaching, and of the miracles, performed by the apostles, to adopt the religion of Christ, they did not undergo a long examination, or make preparations for baptism, but were baptised without delay, some on the same day, some in the night, and some at the very hour. Acts ii. 37, 38, 41; three thousand at Pentecost, chap. xvi. 14, 15; Lydia on the first day, and before Paul entered the house; and chap. xvi. 30—33, the gaoler at Philippi in the

night; and the instructions in the new religion were subsequently given to the converts. He, whose mind was convinced by the miracles which accompanied the apostolic preaching, believed in Jesus by baptism, namely, that he was the Messiah—the great teacher—Judge both of the living and of the dead, and bound himself to receive the commands which might subsequently be enjoined him. Instructions, therefore, very reasonably followed baptism. With us, indeed, this cannot be the case, for we have no workers of miracles, and in our days, we can only convince by instruction and by study; although, in my opinion, where the baptism is of an adult, this instruction is sometimes extended too long. What the apostles must have thought of infant baptism, when they received this command from Jesus, will be obvious to one who is not unacquainted with the customs of the Jews. The Jews, even during the time of Christ, baptised proselytes; namely, Pagans who attached themselves to the Jewish people and to the religion of Moses, and who considered themselves, by the rites of baptism, and not, in point of fact, by circumcision, the children of Abraham. I have explained this more fully in my other works. The Jewish

baptism of proselytes extended to children, to the little children of the Pagans who embraced the religion of the Jews. When Jesus, therefore, says to those who were already accustomed to the baptism of Pagan children, " make all nations my disciples, by baptism and by teaching," placing baptism before teaching, it was impossible but that they should think that the children of the heathen who embraced Christianity were to be baptised. In fact, if Jesus had not wished to express this, he would, as expressly, have condemned the customary baptism of infants amongst the Jews, as an abuse, but by not doing so, Jews could only understand him, according to the tenor of those existing customs with which they were already connected. This is now the passage in the translation, both in the authorised English bible and in Luther's version in German, which has led to such practical results, which no one more than Luther would have endeavoured to prevent, and which he would have considered as a needless torment of the mind, and productive only of schism and enthusiasm. He translated into German, (and the same holds good in the English version,) with some degree of looseness, justifiable upon general principles, at times, but here, unfortu-

nately, erroneous: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." From this translation it was gradually adopted into other European Protestant translations, (it was already in the Catholic Vulgate,) it was introduced into the Lutheran catechism, and even into the form of baptism, to which, whenever we happen to be present at the ceremony, we attend always with some degree of thought; and the consequence is, that numbers have believed the baptism of infants, adopted in the church, to be contrary to the command and injunctions of Christ; for he commanded first to teach and then to baptise. Amongst the very many who had not the courage openly to quit the church, and who dreaded not, I will say, punishment, (for that is not the character of our church,) but the remonstrance of its ministers, and the criticism of the public, or what weighed with many, the loss of an official or professional situation, conscience was seriously at work, and produced what was still worse, predetermined sins against a vacillating faith; a child is brought to the clergyman for the purpose of baptism; his con-

science tells him that he is acting wrong, but he feels that he cannot retain his office, if he does not baptise it. He makes numerous excuses to himself, but still his conscience will not allow him to feel easy. I have known a conscientious and learned clergyman, whose situation did not necessarily call upon him to baptise, but who held that it was necessary for us to be satisfied that Christ had no where forbidden infant baptism. But this was mere plaister to the wound. Another relied upon the circumcision taking place the eighth day; but to this conscience would answer: "It does not appear in the history of circumcision that they are to teach and circumcise; even the heathen, who were made servants or slaves by the Israelites, were circumcised. Another considers baptism to be meant, Colossians ii. 11, "by the circumcision without hands," although we cannot conceive how baptism can take place without hands; the priest always uses his hands, and we cannot consequently reconcile it to our conscience that Paul is there merely speaking of baptism. The layman who brings his child to the font cannot be supposed to be, and in fact generally is not so well acquainted with these objections, as the clergyman; but I know an

instance in the town where I was born, of the parent feeling such reluctance to the child being baptised according to the usual form, that it was subsequently christened by order of the magistrates. Others had more courage, and, in some instances, from strong feelings of conscience, became Anabaptists of a different kind, and separated themselves from the church. With this church, however, they were more in unison than even many of its theologians amongst themselves, and hence the origin of many minor sects. In some respects, we cannot be surprised at their conduct; the cause of schism was to be found in the authorised version of their church, and their founders had not sufficient learning to investigate the text from which it was made. But the error was not confined to the unlearned only; it extended (as errors usually do, where the translation is read in infancy, and imbibed from constant habit, until attention is worn away by repetition,) to men even of the first learning. I mention the name of *Suicer* with reverence; I have often consulted his "Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus" with advantage; but when I look for the Greek word which Luther and the English translators have rendered into "to teach," I do not find it

" to make disciples," although the examples quoted by him, would be equally applicable to this latter sense, and indeed some of them, as quoted by him, could not well be used in any other. Luther himself was not the original author of this mistake, he found it in the Vulgate, " teach all nations," but he did worse; he introduced the word " and," which made it, as in the English translation, run thus: " Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations," and further on, " and baptise them." Certainly his translation, as well as the English, reads more pleasantly, much more than the Latin, and even more so than the English, which has the inconvenience of a badly-sounding repetition; so much so, that a common reader would fancy the greater error to be in the two last, and not easily give credit to the scholar, who should attempt to undeceive him, and explain to him the true meaning of the Greek word. It is thus that good writing may unintentionally produce serious effects. Baumgarten's translation is precisely as the English, and sounds badly; to show the effect, for instance, of an incorrect translation, in the Greek and in the Eastern churches, we hear of no difficulties about infant baptism, but solely in the Latin and in the Pro-

testant churches. Is it not obvious that the Vulgate, that Luther's, and the subsequent translations, have been the cause of this error? To him who reads the Testament in Greek, in Arabic, or in Syriac, no doubt could reasonably occur. But I must here, where a passage is so important, and when the Vulgate, the translation of Luther, and the English translation, are so extensively and so implicitly used, state my reasons why I consider this translation to be erroneous.

1. My first reason I have in common with many commentators, orthodox, heterodox, and learned, and this I have before stated; for can there be a more extraordinary expression than "teach, baptising, teaching?" And yet such is the reading which must take place if we translate the Greek word μαθητεύειν by "teach;" therefore the other, "make disciples, make Christians," must be preferred. I should think this would be sufficient.

2. But besides this, both Luther and the English translators have taken the liberty of introducing the conjunction "and," neither according to the letter of the Greek or according to the fact itself. Supposing even that "to teach," were the right translation, it would be

" teach, so that at the same time you baptise, you teach also."

3. But what is most important, and that which has been too little considered is, that there is no instance in the Greek language of the word being used in this sense; no instance of it has been adduced. Whether the word means simply to " teach" is the great question, or whether it includes " the making" or " the having a disciple." I see no illustration of it any where: nothing like this, " he taught me philosophy." That no such passage occurs in profane Greek writers is admitted, for in not one of them does the Greek word occur with an accusative case, or governing another. And what Suicer has collected from ecclesiastical writers, proves nothing, or rather the reverse. But admitting even the propriety of construing the Greek word into " teach," still it would not apply to the effect of any public preaching, but merely to the first and preparatory instruction, which a teacher gives to those who intend to be baptised. But it was not in this sense that it was so understood by the apostles, for they baptised immediately on the first day, in the first night, in the first house, without much previous instruction on the part of the new con-

verts.* I here recollect a debt, which it is my duty to discharge. After having applied the principal points of what I have here been writing to my "Compendium of Dogmatic Theology," in 1760, as connected with the propriety, and I may say the injunction to baptise infants, the Councillor of the Consistory Jacobi, called upon me publicly to show that the Greek word might be translated "to make disciples." The challenge was a serious one, since its development would essentially contribute to tranquillize many tender consciences, but I could not at the time comply with it, partly because I had no opportunity of writing upon the subject; for it is not at Göttingen, as in some universities, where the professors are engaged in academical disputation; partly because I had not collectede nough to satisfy myself, that the translation "to teach," was no where shown, and that "to make or to have a disciple" was in conformity with Greek grammar. As an opportunity now

* I think it makes much in favour of Michaelis, that the two words rendered in our translation "teach" and "teaching" should be different in Greek; a proof that the meaning is distinct, for if they were intended to convey the same meaning, they would not have been different. J. D.

offers of accepting the challenge, I shall not decline it, connected as it is with so many sincere and religious scruples, and regretting only that I am obliged to be diffuse.

1. The Greek word, either with an accusative case, or directly governing another word is, as Kypke has remarked on Matthew xxvii. 57, not to be met with in any profane author, although it has occurred as connected with a doctrine in which sense it means, "to belong to," or be part of a disciple or a hearer. He has confirmed this by several examples from profane authors, and Suicer has done the same from the Fathers of the church, so that I need only refer to their works for my authority.

2. Words ending in a similar manner to that in Matthew, acquire a power of governing an accusative case, but with this condition, that they create the thing or person governed to be what the verb itself is. This is especially the case in the Septuagint; thus, for instance, "to be a king, to come to the crown," is the ordinary translation of the Greek word which signifies this event. But it is very common also, when "to make a king, to cause a king to be made," is the evident sense required. Thus, in Judges ix. 16, "Ye have made Abimelech

king," is the evident sense, and not, " ye have reigned over Abimelech." Also, 1 Sam. viii. 22, xii. 1; 2 Sam. ii. 9; 1 Kings i. 43, xii. 1, 20; 2 Kings iii. 27, viii. 20, xii. 12, xiv. 21, xvii. 21, xxi. 24, xxiii. 30, xxiv. 17; 2 Chron. i. 8, 9, 11, x. 1, 17, xxi. 8, xxii. 1, xxvi. 1, xxxiii. 25, xxxvi. 10; Isaiah vii. 6; Ezekiel xvii. 16; Job xxxiv. 30.

3. Christ did not speak Greek, but Chaldee or Hebrew, and the question is, what word is he likely to have used? I should say that it was most probably that which all the oriental translators have used, and they could find no other to express the sense of " making a disciple." The same applies to the Syriac and to the Arabic, whether as translating from the Syriac, or translating from the Greek. In their languages the original root means, " a disciple or a hearer," and the sense is borne out by the common forms of conversation. The literal translation from the Syriac is applicable to it in the strictest sense. Thus Jeremiah xv. 19, " Let them return unto thee." Ephraim the Syrian explains it—" He is here speaking of Baruch and of others, who became his disciples." A similar example occurs in my " Syriac Hand Book," where speaking of Diodorus, a Mace-

donian, the Syriac word, answering to the Greek now in question, says " he became a Christian."

4. Can it be necessary to bring forward examples of a word which no good Greek writers have ever adopted, in the active sense, but solely in the neuter? These last I can bring from the New Testament, and from the Fathers, but I can produce no instance in which the Greek word has been found in the active sense of " teaching," ascribed to it by the authorised version. The first passage that occurs is in the New Testament, Matthew xxvii. 57; although here there is a various reading. We have it, " who also himself was Jesus's disciple," but four manuscripts, amongst which we may reckon two of the most ancient, read in the passive sense, " who also himself became," or was made, " a disciple of Jesus." I do not myself hold the reading to be genuine, but merely an annotation from the sixth or even an earlier century, which has been adopted from the margin, and inserted in the main text; but it is clear that the commentator, or old transcriber, who explained the words " was a disciple," by the words " became or was made a disciple," knew, from the Greek in familiar use

in his day, that " to make disciples" was the real meaning of the word, and more known to him than the other, of being " merely a disciple." Another passage is in Acts xiv. 21. I place it in a connected form, that we may see that by disciples are meant Christians. " As the disciples stood round about him (viz. Paul, who had been stoned, and was supposed to be dead) he rose up, and came into the city, and the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe. And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many," (made many disciples,) " they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium and to Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples," &c. It is here clear that the Greek word translated " taught many" is better rendered by " having made many disciples;" it is distinguished from the preaching of the gospel, and the word " many" shows that the question is not about preaching, to which all had access, but relates to conversion and to adoption in the Christian church. The old Latin translation, preserved in the Cambridge Manuscript has this exactly, " when they had made many disciples."

5. But even amongst the fathers of the church, the word may be found in this signifi-

cation. I will not rely upon the passage from the epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, (Oxford ed. 1708,) " I do not commend you, as if I were anything; for if I even now am bound for the sake of the name, I am nevertheless not perfect in Christ. I am now only beginning to become a disciple, and exhort you only as fellow students." Nor yet another from Justin Martyr, which it may be contended will apply equally to " teaching" as to " becoming a disciple." But here is a passage from Justin Martyr, in his correspondence with Tryphon, which appears to me to be conclusive. Speaking of the durable punishment, which God inflicted upon the unbelieving Jew, he says, " in the same way as God formerly (namely in the time of Elijah) did not perfect their punishment, on account of the seven thousand, he has not even to this day fulfilled their sentence and does not fulfil it, because he knows that some are daily *made disciples*, and abandon the path of error." Here the Greek word is used, which in Matth. xxviii. 19, is translated " taught," both in the English and the German bibles. Again, when Justin Martyr will explain the prophecy, Gen. xlix. 11, of the conversion of the heathen, " For there were a foal that had not yet carried, or

had had any yoke upon his neck until Christ came and made them his disciples, through the disciples whom he sent, and they took the yoke of the word upon them." Here again the Greek word is used precisely as in Matthew.

"*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*"] We know how frequently this passage is quoted as a proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, by many, indeed, who do not believe this doctrine, and wish, perhaps, to undermine it. I must confess, that I cannot see it in this point of view. The eternal divinity of the Son, which is so clearly taught in other passages, particularly John i. 1—14, and Romans ix. 5, is here not once mentioned, and it is impossible to understand, from this passage, whether the Holy Ghost is a person. The meaning of Jesus may have been this: Those who were baptized should, upon their baptism, confess, that they believed in the Father, and in the Son, and in all the doctrines inculcated by the Holy Spirit,—both those which occur in the Old Testament, as well as those which the apostles were to deliver under the influence of divine inspiration, and which as yet they had not learnt; that they were to receive and believe these doctrines, and, in one word, embrace

the whole divine revelation. In fact, I do not believe that the words in the form of baptism can signify more, because it was impossible for the majority of those who believed, to think more upon the subject at the time; for they were not regularly instructed in the mystery of the Trinity before baptism, and only received complete instruction in the doctrines of Christianity after baptism. Read only the second chapter of the Acts, where three thousand were baptized in one day. What did these persons know of the divinity of Christ, of which Peter, in his discourse, did not say one word? What did they know of the personality of the Holy Ghost? They were not doctrines of the Jewish church, which, in the first instance, might be assumed; and yet they are baptized, (presuming the apostles to have fulfilled these commands of Jesus,) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. What could they otherwise think, but that they acknowledged, by baptism, Jesus to be the Son of God and the Christ; the gifts of the Holy Ghost (which, as Peter observed, they both saw and heard) to be no delusion, but to descend from heaven; and the doctrines which the apostles were to teach, under the influence of divine inspiration,

to be those which they did, and which they ought to believe? This is the more striking, where, in Acts xvi. 33, it is not to be supposed that the jailor should have known any thing of the eternal divinity of Christ, and of the personality of the Holy Ghost; or that Paul, in his very short conversation, (v. 32,) should have instructed him in it, as we find no traces of it in his first discourses, contained in the 13th and 17th chapters. The oldest illustration of these words coincides with what has been above stated. It is taken from Justin Martyr, who lived in the first part of the second century, and is in his second apology, where he describes the baptism of the Christians: "The name of God, the Father, and the Lord of all things, is pronounced over him who is regenerated and repents of his sins. We say only '*the name*,' when we conduct him who is to be washed, to the bath; for if any one imagines he can really pronounce his name, he is mad: (the name of God is unspeakable:) and this bath is termed illumination, (an old name for baptism, see Hebrews vi. 4,) because it enlightens the understanding of those who learn this doctrine. Again, he who is enlightened, is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified

under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who has long declared, through the prophets, every thing respecting Jesus Christ."

21. *And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."*] In our language, this gives rise to a dubious meaning. A Greek scholar will immediately perceive, that it does not mean "to the extreme ends of the earth;" but to "the last day, to the period of the destruction of this world." In this manner, not only those are addressed, who were the then disciples of Jesus; but also all those who, as John says, (xvii. 20,) shall believe, through their word. "I am with you," is certainly not meant in a bodily sense, but implies the love, providence, assistance, and protection of Christ, upon which believers may rely as long as the world exists. Just as little can I suppose, that Christ here extends to his church the power of performing miracles to the last day; (for this would be a sorrowful doctrine, since in this case no church and no believers could exist; we must be all eternally condemned, since we see no miracles now, except under the influence of imposture and delusion.) I do not, however, deny that a person can perform mira-

cles, if God be with him; but God may be with a man, and render him assistance, without miracles. I will here quote the language of a very rational and learned man, a Syrian, (and Christ spoke Syriac,) the great philosopher, physician, and historian, Gregory Bar Hebræus, Primate of the Syrian church, who was incontestably the most learned man of his day, in the thirteenth century. He said upon his deathbed to his scholars, "If ye continue in love I will be amongst you." This sensible man did not contemplate any bodily presence; and still less that his philosophical and medical students should perform miracles through his influence; he merely had in view a sentiment of good and common feeling, and the natural harmony of virtuous minds. An explanation has been given to this passage, in which I can as little join; namely, that "the end of the world" signifies "the end of the Mosaic period." That the Greek word should ever convey this sense, and imply the rites and laws of Moses, has been adopted solely upon conjecture, and is unsupported by admissible authority: I would rather say, that Jesus, according to this mode of interpreting his declaration, was to be with his disciples, not merely to the end of the Mosaic

period, but beyond it; for many of them survived the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place thirty-seven years afterwards, and John the Evangelist was decidedly of that number. It is an ingenious conjecture to do away the supposition, that under this promise was conveyed a pledge to perform miracles to the end of the world; although there is not one word said about miracles, and the question here is not at all applicable.

"*Amen.*"] The common appendix of transcribers of Biblical books; but which the oldest and most important manuscripts omit, and which may therefore not be considered as genuine. Amen, amongst the Hebrews, was not affixed to the termination of books, the same as it is in our sermons; but to the end of prayer and holy aspirations. Modern transcribers, accustomed to hear Amen in the church, have introduced it into almost all Biblical books, naturally concluding, that the reader would say Amen at the end of the book.

XIV. The ascension of Christ.

Mark xvi. 19, 20. Luke xxiv. 50—53.

Two of the evangelists, Matthew and John, do not relate this history, an omission, of which the adversaries of Christianity have not failed to avail themselves. The most important part, they say, is wanting, so that those who read only these two evangelists, would suppose Jesus to be still upon earth with his disciples, in conformity with what he has said: (Matt. xxviii. 21:) "I am with you always to the end of the world." I could be almost tempted to add strength to this doubt, and to say, that the third evangelist Mark omits it; for the last part of his sixteenth chapter appears to me, as I have several times said, the work of a foreign hand. But now, what arises from this omission? Precisely, that the evangelists did not think it necessary, in a history which belongs to this world, and which narrates the life of Christ, to record the ascension which the apostles afterwards so openly preached, and which they assumed as a notorious fact, in

their communication with the world. But a word or two about this omission. John omits it, in the same way as he omits the birth of Jesus; from which however no one would conclude that Jesus was not born, and that the circumstance of his birth was a mere fabrication, an imposture. He conforms here to his usual custom of omitting that which others have accurately related, and which therefore he assumes, from their writings, to be known. His silence is rather confirmation. Nay, more, we may infer from his gospel, that he assumes the ascension of Christ as known, although he does not relate it, when Jesus speaks as he does, vi. 62; and again, where on the very day of his resurrection, xx. 17, he says, "I ascend to my Father, and to your Father; and to my God, and to your God." I will not enter more into detail, such as his speaking (xxi. 22) of his coming, and which some have concluded from the twenty-third verse, to predict his coming to the day of judgment. I might easily accumulate passages. Mark omits it, from his having been interrupted in the progress of his gospel, at the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter. Matthew omits it, as he probably omitted in the Hebrew gospel, (see my Intro-

duction to the New Testament, ch. 901,) an account of the birth of Jesus; but every shadow of contradiction vanishes, when we turn to the language of Jesus, as recorded by Matthew (xxvi. 64) previous to his crucifixion: "Hereafter, ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

MARK XVI. 19, 20.

19. "*So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.*

20. "*And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.*

19. "*So then after the Lord had spoken with them.*"] I do not conceive this to refer immediately to the words Jesus had just spoken, but to the frequent conversations he held with his disciples, and in which he enjoined them to act up to the commandments he had given. I do not doubt the fact, as recorded in Mark; but if we had not the assistance of Luke, we should conclude that Jesus ascended to heaven immediately after the words he had spoken with them. It is not for me to discuss the merits of

this question, ignorant as I am of the name of the writer of these last verses; but it would be doing injustice to an unknown writer, to charge him with an error, merely because Luke happens, in this instance, to be better informed.

20. Some manuscripts have the "Amen" at the end of this verse. The examples are to be found in Wetstein. Several of our common editions have it not, and they are right.

LUKE XXIV. 50—53.

50. *"And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them.*

51. *"And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.*

52. *"And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy;*

53. *"And were continually in the temple, praising and blessing of God. Amen."*

50. *"He led them out."*] Namely, from Jerusalem. As Luke has not related the journey of the disciples to Galilee, it was not necessary for him to mention their return to Jerusalem; and the reader therefore will represent to himself the disciples as being still in Jerusalem.

"*As far as to Bethany.*"] This is not to be emphatically construed, "even unto Bethany;" and in fact such a translation is inconsistent with a sound knowledge of the Greek language, and were misplaced, as Bethany was not much more than nine furlongs from Jerusalem. The Greek properly signifies, "to Bethany." I have explained this in my Comments on 1 Macc. ii. 58.

52. "*Worshipped him.*"] Not merely those who defend, but those who impugn the divinity of Christ, have made the just observation, that this is something more, than what we read in other parts of the gospel, where an individual has thrown himself at the feet of Jesus in a state of gratitude and admiration. If we do this to some one whom we see, it is the common mental prostration, and only a high testimony of personal respect; but if we do this to one whom we do not see, it becomes then actual adoration.

53. The "Amen" here is incorrect.

Acts i. 1—12.

1. "*The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began to do and teach,*

2. "*Until the day in which he was taken up,*

after that he, through the Holy Ghost, had given commandments unto the apostles, whom he had chosen;

3. *To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.*

4. "*And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me.*

5. "*For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence.*

6. "*When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*

7. "*And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father has put in his own power!*

8. "*But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.*

9. "*And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.*

10. *"And while they looked stedfastly towards heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel;*

11. *"Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*

12. *"Then returned they unto Jerusalem, from the mountain called Olives, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey."*

Luke writes this some years subsequent to his gospels, after having had it in his power to learn from eye-witnesses many circumstances of which he was ignorant at the time he wrote his gospel. He had travelled for some time in company with Paul, and from him he may have learnt what that apostle mentions, Corinth. xv. 5, 6, 7. He does not, it is true, repeat the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, because they do not properly belong to his second history, but he states the commands of Jesus to his disciples, because they actually do belong to his history;—but it may very well happen, that he supposes that to be known at the time of his writing the Acts, which he did not know,

and therefore did not relate, when he wrote his gospel.

1. "*The former treatise have I made.*"] That the word in pure Greek signifies "a book," has been sufficiently exemplified by Wetstein and by Kypke. It should be read, therefore, "book," and not "discourse," as it is in some translations.

"*Of all.*"] No one can reasonably expect from a writer, that he has not omitted anything of what Jesus did or taught: in such a small space it would be impossible: he merely seems to imply, that he has written generally the life of Jesus, without entering into all the minutiæ.

"*Began.*"] As opposed to the further extension of the Gospel, through the medium of the apostles, and which he now proposes describing in the second book.

2. "*Through the Holy Ghost.*"] Two constructions of these words are possible, but between which, I remain to a certain degree doubtful.

1. Taken in connexion with the preceding words, it would be thus;—he gave them commandment through the Holy Ghost, that is, through divine inspiration. The meaning then

would be, that he gave them commands with respect to the will of God, and being himself inspired by God, his commandments were, therefore, the commandments of God.

2. But taken in connexion with the words that follow, "whom he had chosen through the Holy Ghost," the meaning would be, that Jesus did not choose his disciples, according to his own discretion, but through divine inspiration. See Matthew xx. 23, and Luke vi. 12, 13. I have entered upon this, further, in my observations upon the Syriac Acts of the Apostles. This construction has been the least adopted, but it is the one most strenuously defended by Kypke. I prefer, but reluctantly prefer this last interpretation. I do not entirely adopt it, and I could have wished the text had been, "that he had given them commands with respect to, and on account of, the Holy Ghost," with reference to the promise given, that the Holy Spirit should be poured out upon them, and that they were to remain at Jerusalem, until the promise should be fulfilled. No manuscript, at least no one that has yet been collated, or ancient translation, has this reading, and to translate it so, with the present text, would be contrary to grammar or to custom.

Two constructions are, however, decidedly to be rejected.

1. Those who translate it "after he had given them commandments through the Holy Ghost," and who contend that it was given them, John xx. 22. He gave them their commandments, verbally, and not through the Holy Ghost, but promised that they should receive it, after his ascension.

2. Those who consider it as bearing this sense, "that he was taken up through the Holy Ghost unto heaven:" a most extraordinary construction, and one which will not bear examination.

3. "*Forty days.*"] Whether this connects with that which precedes, or that which follows, I know not; nor is it, in fact, of much consequence, since the sense remains the same. It would appear, that, independent of the times that have been named, and have been recorded by the four evangelists, Jesus had other and familiar intercourse with the disciples, and, perhaps, in Galilee, but as Luke is not more particular upon this subject, I will rather profess my ignorance, than hazard conjecture.

"*Being seen of them.*"] Not that he appeared to them, but that his presence was of

that nature, as is the case with those whom we see from casual or stated intercourse. A passage in the Book of Tobit, quoted by Heinsius, explains this well. The angel is made to say, that he appeared to them in the shape of a common man, and that they had not taken him for an angel:—"All these days I did appear unto you; but I did neither eat nor drink, but ye did see a vision." Tobit xii. 19.

4. "*Being assembled together.*"] Every one, who understands Greek, knows that the original signifies "to assemble," "to be together," and "to eat with me," and that there has been a question, which should be preferred.

"*With.*"] Jesus did actually eat with his disciples, and the Syriac, the Arabic translation, edited by Espenius, and the vulgate confirm it; but, as on further reading, the immediate subject seems to apply to the ascension, and not to the appearance on the day of resurrection, the above construction seems unappropriate. Others conceive, that Jesus only conversed with his disciples, and in this they are borne out by the old Latin translation, "and when he had conversation with them;" and by the Arabic, printed in the Polyglott. I do not reject this by any means, and offer my ideas upon it thus; that

Jesus was again together with his disciples, and (for the sake of connexion with what follows) for the last time, previous to his ascension, that he then instructs his disciples agreeably to what we afterwards read, and that they then interrogate him, respecting the kingdom of Israel. Another illustration, however, occurs to me, which I do not, however, contend for, but leave to the discretion of my readers. The Greek word may be rendered "to assemble," to command that others should "assemble and remain together." Supposing this sense to be admitted, then it might be—

1. That he commanded them to remain together, and not to quit Jerusalem until they had received the Holy Ghost.

2. As Luke must have known of the journey to Galilee when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles, he commanded them to return from Galilee to Jerusalem, and to assemble on a given day, and in some particular place.

Lightfoot, who understood this passage to apply to the meeting in Galilee, has been sufficiently refuted by Whitby. When Jesus commanded his disciples not to depart from Jerusalem, it is evident that they were then at Jerusalem.

"*Should not depart from Jerusalem.*"] I have already remarked, that this injunction is not at all at variance with the appearance in Galilee. If we say to any one, you shall not quit such a town, (as, for instance, you are not to leave the university before you shall have received an answer to an application, or before you shall have received a specific summons,) this is not a positive confinement within the precincts of a town, or a prohibition to be literally understood not to move from it, but merely an order generally that you are not to leave it; in fact, that you are not to change your usual residence. But, this illustration appears to me unnecessary, for I cannot understand it in any other light, than as recording the conversation which Jesus had with the disciples, the day of the ascension.

5. John introduced his proselytes to the new religion, which he preached by the command of God, solely by baptism with water. But you shall now be introduced to a higher baptism, by the most copious effusion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Baptism was, also amongst the Jews, a confession of having adopted a new religion.

6. "*When they, therefore, were come to-*

gether."] This "therefore" contributes to make the whole more intelligible; especially when taken in connexion with what precedes, namely, that according to my illustration of it, he had commanded that they should come together.

"Wilt thou, at this time, restore again the kingdom to Israel."] The meaning of the words "restore again the kingdom to the people" is sufficiently obvious, to restore their ancient freedom and independence to a people who had, in former times, been independent, but had now lost their liberty, and were now become the subjects of others." The disciples expect the Messiah will do this; and, in fact, they were justified by the prophecies of Daniel, ii. 44, 45. vii. 13, 14, 27., in expecting a splendid reign for Israel. They are anxious to know when the time is drawing near; and what will be the nature of their agency in the erection of this new kingdom?" I cannot refrain from being surprised, that some commentators, and even Whitby, have found here such difficulties, namely, that the Israelites never had the kingdom, and that, consequently, it could not be restored to them: they wish, therefore, to translate the passage, unconnected with common usage, "wilt

thou give the kingdom to Israel?" But had not the Israelites an independent, and a brilliant kingdom under David and Solomon? And again, after the return from the Babylonish captivity, were they not independent under John Hyrcanus, his son Alexander, and his successors? What can be the object of these commentators? They contemplate an universal monarchy, and this, they say, the Jews never had; this is true, but the original word in Greek does not convey the idea of universal monarchy. Why should they contemplate that which the disciples have not once mentioned? These last certainly had not in view a spiritual kingdom, which should be assigned to Christ and not to the people of Israel, nor could they contemplate the millenium mentioned in the Apocalypse.

7. When I read the answer of Christ, I can only construe it thus: The people of Israel may expect hereafter liberty, independence, and national power, but the disciples are not to be embarassed with these notions; they are to do their duty, they are to be witnesses, when they shall have received the Holy Ghost, of what they have seen and heard, and propagate the Christian religion amongst Jews and heathens.

"*The times or the seasons.*"] As these words (χρόνους ἢ καιρούς) are distinguished by the disjunctive particle "or," they cannot be considered as exactly synonimous, but must be taken in some sense contrasting with each other. "Time," for instance, is used as "delay," Revelations x. 6, namely, "the fulfilment shall no longer be delayed, but in the days of the seventh angel the mystery shall be finished." "Season," on the other hand, signifies the convenient, the happy, the appropriate time. I am fortified in this case, by the parallel passage of Demosthenes: "What time or what season," or in other words, "what delay or what opportunity can you expect, superior to that which now offers?" But as we have, perhaps, in English, no two words exactly corresponding with the Greek originals, the real meaning, expressed circuitously, would be, "It is not for you to know the time to which it is postponed, or the season when it will take take place.

"*After that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.*"] Literally, when the Holy Ghost comes upon you. The Syriac, as well as some other translations, render it, "but ye shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you." If

this, however, were the correct translation, the Greek, rendered by "of the," would stand in another place.

"*Witnesses.*"] Not preachers, as we sometimes hear it stated from the pulpit, but witnesses, in the actual sense of the word, of what they had seen and heard, and, in particular, of their having seen him, after his resurrection from the dead.

9. "*And a cloud received him.*"] I do not understand this to be, that a cloud descended from the mountain and afterwards served to convey him to the skies, this would be contrary to the order in which the words stand, but that his body began to rise from the earth, ascended gradually, and at length a cloud intervened between him and the sight of his disciples, covered him, and drew, as it were, a curtain around him. Independent of the dignity of the fact recorded, it coincides with what profane writers have handed down to us, when describing the appearance and the evanescence of superior beings. Wetstein and Kypke have given us several instances of it. A cloudy atmosphere, an air, or some medium not directly transparent, received their divinities, or upon the commands of their divinities, men. I do not conceive that

profane writers have imitated the appearances described in the Bible, of which they were confessedly ignorant; but when God visibly interferes in human affairs, he acts according to the measure of human conception and human capacities; a truth which we read in the fables and poems of the most polished people and of the greatest poets. These fables and these poems are, if I may so express myself, the archives of the opinions of the human race, relative to the manner in which they conceive the Divinity would act with regard to his creatures.

10. "*Shall so come.*"] This is generally understood as an assurance that Jesus would come again, in the same manner as they, his disciples, had seen him ascend to heaven. In this case we must take the words "in like manner," in a very extended sense; for, according to the doctrine of the apostles, Jesus will appear, at the last judgment, very different from what the apostles saw him, when he ascended to heaven; namely, in a public manner, and not before eleven disciples, but before the whole world, accompanied by his angels, amidst the sound and conflagration of a world in ruins, not with the body with which he rose, but with a transfigured and a glorious body. I am therefore

inclined to agree with Wetstein and others, who look to the whole as a question, and who give it this meaning: "Why are ye looking after him, with your eyes directed towards heaven? Do you imagine, that he will return again in the same manner as you have seen him ascend into heaven? Such a hope is illusory."

12. Moses has no where defined the extent of a sabbath day's journey, but, according to his dispensation, it was permitted to extend to any distance, provided it was not bodily labour, undertaken with a view to gain; even the violent action of dancing was connected with the solemnity of the sabbath. The sabbath day's journey is a pharisaical institution, deeply tinged with ignorance, as I have shown in my discourse upon the Mosaic jurisprudence. It was taken from Exodus xvi. 29, and Numbers xxxvi. 5, and in the time of Christ it was already in practice, so that it at length became a measure of distance, as with us the league and the mile. The sabbath day's journey, or the distance allowed out of the walls of the town, (for within the town, if it was as long as London, or as Nineveh, which was three day's journey, it was permitted to move about at pleasure,) was 2000 cubits beyond the city walls;

and this they reckoned, probably not with mathematical accuracy, at seven stadia; hence the Syriac translation renders "the sabbath day's journey," by "seven stadia." The sense, if we read Luke without comment, is sufficiently easy. He is speaking of the Mount of Olives; and in describing it to persons unacquainted with its situation, he says it lies so near to Jerusalem, as to be a sabbath day's journey from it. According to Josephus (Antiq. b. xx. s. 8, 6,) it was only five stadia from Jerusalem, and consequently within that distance; consequently on the sabbath day one might go to the foot of the mountain. It is astonishing what difficulties the commentators, and even very learned ones, have found in this passage, because they imagined that Luke and Josephus contradicted one another. Grotius and Waser wish to alter the reading in Josephus, (though in all the manuscripts,) and to read seven for five; rather a hardy alteration, since Josephus in another place (Jewish Wars, b. 2, s. 2, 3,) says, "Titus Vespasian erected his camp six stadia from Jerusalem, upon the Mount of Olives." Others have conceived that the situation of the Mount of Olives, where Jesus ascended to heaven, may have been seven stadia from Jerusalem, but

this cannot be, because Jesus asended to heaven from Bethany, (Luke xxiv. 50,) and that was considerably on the other side of the mountain. Kypke supposed that Luke calculated at seven stadia, not the distance of the mountain from Jerusalem, but its length from one side to the other. This is a most unfortunate illustration. What writer would ever think of giving the admeasurement of a mountain, when it is neither required nor even alluded to. Besides, a sabbath day's journey is not a measure applicable to a field, as it is not from a field, but from the walls of a city that such admeasurement would commence. Unluckily for this comment, the Mount of Olives is not seven, but ten stadia long: its western bounds were five stadia from Jerusalem; its eastern boundary, where Bethpage was situated, was (John xi. 18,) fifteen stadia, consequently the difference between the two would be ten stadia, and gives the length of the mountain. What I have said tends to remove a contradiction, which, it has been alleged, makes Luke at variance with himself. Luke xxiv. 50, says that Jesus led his disciples as far as Bethany, which was fifteen stadia from Jerusalem. But Luke, in the Acts of the